



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The following communication by RICHARD SAINTHILL, Esq., was read, with permission of the Council, by AQUILLA SMITH, M. D., M. R. I. A.

THE OLD COUNTESS OF DESMOND. AN INQUIRY,—DID SHE SEEK REDRESS AT THE COURT OF QUEEN ELIZABETH, AS RECORDED IN THE JOURNAL OF ROBERT SYDNEY, EARL OF LEYCESTER? AND DID SHE EVER SIT FOR HER PORTRAIT?

I was detained in London during the winter of 1829, dancing attendance on lawyers, and, but for the reading-room at the British Museum, should have had many a weary day. The late Sir Wm. Betham found me there, copying, from a Harleian MS., No. 1425, a pedigree of the Desmonds; and on my explaining to him that I was anxious to ascertain to which of the Earls Sir Walter Raleigh's old lady was Countess, Sir William offered to assist me from his own MSS. with a more correct document than the Harleian. Official and other avocations interposed, and occasioned a considerable delay to his kind intentions; when he sent me the rough draft of a very voluminous pedigree (to be corrected at leisure, which probably never arrived), with permission to copy, of which I availed myself as far as the direct line of the Earls was concerned. Waiting this document, I worked on, with the aid of the Harleian, in which Thomas Fitz James, beheaded at Drogheda, 8th February, 1467, is called the ninth earl. In Sir William Betham's pedigree he ranks as eighth earl; his eldest son and successor (James), in the Harleian, tenth earl, is there recorded to have been murdered at Rathkeale, 1487, and to have been unmarried.

Sir Walter Raleigh having stated that his old Countess was married in the reign of Edward IV., "and held her jointure from *all* the Earls of Desmond since then," the inference I drew was, that her husband must have been an earl during Edward IV.'s reign; and before receiving Sir William Betham's MS., I drew his attention to this; for as Edward IV. died in 1483, we seemed to have no choice but Ellen Barry, the mother of Earl James. In reply, dated 5th December, 1832, Sir William wrote:—"You are mistaken in supposing James, ninth earl, died unmarried; his wife was Margaret, daughter of Thady O'Bryen, and is much more likely to have been the lady alluded to. She might have danced with the Duke of Gloucester *before she was Countess of Desmond*, a title she only bore for a few months; for she became Dowager on the murder of her husband, in 1467, *not* 1487." And on further discussion on this question, in a letter, dated the 9th of January, 1833, Sir William wrote:—"I think there is not much doubt that this Margaret was the *real old Countess*;" and further on, in the same letter, "*she must have been Countess in the reign of Edward IV.* to have enjoyed a jointure *from* that time. James, the ninth earl, died or was killed the same year as his father; but I cannot refer to the authority at present, it being jumbled up with unarranged documents;" and, on the 1st February, 1833, Sir William adds—"the question is, therefore, between

Ellen Barry, widow of Thomas of Drogheda, and Margaret O'Bryen, widow of James, his son. I would give the vote to the younger lady, and I have not much doubt of the accuracy of the decision."

On the 26th November, 1833, Sir William sent me his "original draft of the Desmond pedigree;" and as he, equally with myself, considered Sir Walter Raleigh's authority unquestionable, I proceeded to investigate whether Margaret O'Bryen was not "the pearl" we were so anxiously seeking; and a variety of circumstances seeming to lend their separate and concurring aid, a very possible case that the young widow became the old Countess was apparently made out; which having submitted to Sir William Betham, he wrote me, on the 13th March, 1834—*"I think your Margaret O'Bryen must have been the old Countess; it is scarcely possible that she could be any other, if you consider the dates and circumstances. Pelham must have been in error."*

The paper, the result of this protracted inquiry, was read at the Cork Cuvierian Society, and, in 1844, printed in the first volume of my "Olla Podrida." Some months since, I was informed that in the "Quarterly Review" of March, 1853, the question of the old Countess's identity was clearly established, which, on referring to the volume, and, thanks to the very talented and entertaining writer of the able article, it certainly is, in the person of Kathrin, daughter of Sir John Fitz Gerald, Lord of Decies, who married Sir Thomas Fitzgerald, of Drogheda, third son of Thomas, eighth Earl of Desmond. Sir Thomas succeeded as twelfth Earl of Desmond, being then seventy-six years old, the 18th June, 1529,—say 46 years after the death of Edward IV., Kathrin became his widow in 1530; so that her jointure, instead being held from Edward IV.'s time, did not commence until 51 years after his reign had closed. A record, discovered in the Rolls' Office, Dublin, dated 5th August, 1575, and which clears up the long-puzzling question, is a surrender that she made of "the castell and town of Inchequyne" to Gerrot, the sixteenth earl, in which she describes herself as "the ladye Kathrin, late Wief to Thomas, late Earle of Desmond." There is every probability that this transaction was only a family arrangement, intended, under possible contingencies, to preserve Earl Gerrot's interest in the property, and that the old Countess continued in the occupation of the castle; and, as we shall see, after the earl's forfeiture she was living there, with all her legal rights of jointure, undisturbed and acknowledged.

Her paternity from the Decies' branch is found recorded in the MS. of Sir George Carew, Harleian, No. 1425, at the British Museum; and in another MS., No. 626, of Sir George's, in the Lambeth Library, that she died in 1604.

From the manner in which the deed of 1575 had been mentioned, I understood that it was the original, and with the Ladye Kathrin's autograph attached to it. I therefore requested my very kind friend, Dr. Aquilla Smith, who has more pleasure in conferring obligations than even the most of us have in receiving, to take a drawing of the signature of the old Countess, who at the execution of the deed would have

been about 111 years of age, that I might have it engraved. On inspection at the Rolls' Office, Dublin, the record was found to be only an enrolment, and that the original was an ensealed deed—a very common mode at that time,—to which her signature had *not* been attached.

Since these his discoveries have been made public by the writer in the "Quarterly Review," and Columbus has shown us the egg standing on its end, my paper has been referred to, and designated as "starting a perfectly new *paradox* of his" (Mr. Sainthill's) "own," and that "He fixed on a certain Margaret O'Brien, wife of James, ninth Earl of Desmond, as the Old Countess. Mr. Sainthill submitted his conjecture to Sir William Betham; and Sir William Betham, from his letters, which I possess from Mr. Sainthill, appeared to adopt it, though with some hesitation, and a slight correction of dates, assigning a *later period* for the death of the *supposed* old Countess's *supposed* husband."

The extracts that I have given from Sir William Betham's original letters, which have been returned to me for reference, show that the latter passage must have been written from an erroneous recollection of, and not a present reference to, the correspondence; for so far from Sir William assigning a *later* period than I had done, on the authority of the Harleian (1487), to the death of Earl James, Sir William writes, (5th December, 1832), he was murdered "in 1467, *not* 1487;" and I submitted to *his* correction, and accepted the *earlier* date. Again, as to Sir William's *hesitation* respecting my conjecture, that Margaret O'Brien was the old Countess, it has been seen that I was indebted to Sir William for the knowledge of her having been the wife of Earl James; and he suggested that she was much more likely to have been the Lady; and subsequently, having submitted the question to him, in his letters of the 1st February, 1833, and the 13th March, 1834, he gave his hearty concurrence to the conjecture, and that he thought she *must have been the old Countess*.

To the propriety of this conjecture of mine having been "*a paradox*" I decidedly object. Words, like coins, are estimated and taken without any reference to their original, but to their present current value; and, in general society, "*paradox*" is now understood as an absurd conclusion from certain premises. In my paper the premises were laid down by Sir Walter Raleigh, who had stated that *he himself had known the old Countess of Desmond*, who was married in Edward IV.'s time, and held her jointure *from all the Earls of Desmond since then*. This personal acquaintance with the Countess was deemed to render Sir Walter's statement unquestionable, and consequently to limit the inquiry to the period of Edward IV.'s reign, which commenced 1461, and closed 1483. I considered that it was only within this period that I could look for her; and so limited, and believing, as I do, Sir William Betham correct, that James, the ninth earl, married Margaret O'Brien, I still think, that, whether the earl was murdered in 1467 or 1487 (the latter date making most in my favour), my conclusion was the most probable that could then be arrived at. We now know that the most material part of Sir Walter's limitation, "that she held her jointure from *all* the earls from Edward IV.'s time," was not the *fact*; and my

building, the result of so much inquiry and consideration, rested on a quicksand, instead of being founded, as I fancied, on a rock, most venerable indeed in age and aspect, but which has sunk with it into the depths of darkness!

We may feel assured Sir Walter Raleigh did not intentionally make the misstatement. The old Countess, most probably, told him when she was married; and as in 1589 she had actually been sixty years a resident at Inchequin—a period of time which “the oldest inhabitant” would very naturally greatly lengthen,—Sir Walter might readily assume that her jointure went back to the same reign as her marriage.

I may notice that the Harleian MS. pedigree is a very meagre and imperfect document: it goes but slightly into the collateral branches, and is extremely deficient in the male line; it does not give the wives of its second, third, and fourth earls; and of Thomas, who, by marrying Katherine M'Cormack, lost his earldom and estates, the Harleian record is only “Thomas Fitz John, 7th Earl of Desmond, Obit. at Paris, S. P. 1430,” ignoring any marriage. Sir William Betham gives this expropriated earl a son (Maurice), to whom the usurper of the earldom gave the manors of Moyallow, Kilcolman, and Broghill, which estates descended from Maurice to Raymond Fitz Gerald, of Broghill, executed for high treason, by Sir Henry Brouncker, in the reign of Elizabeth; and to Thomas the twelfth earl (the Harleian's thirteenth), it gives only one wife, “Giles Da. to Connac Oge Cartie Lo. of Muskerri,” ignoring the second wife, Kathrin Fitz Gerald. So that, as far as the Harleian is concerned, the existence even of our old Countess could never have been ascertained. It is very much to be regretted that Sir William Betham's original MS. has not been published; even what I extracted has much valuable information which I have not seen in any other pedigree of the Desmond family.

We now come to the first part of our inquiry.—Did the Old Countess of Desmond seek redress at the Court of Queen Elizabeth, as recorded in the Journal of Robert Sydney, Earl of Leycester?

The original MS. of the earl is at Penshurst Castle, Kent, and is believed not to have been published; but in the British Museum's additional MSS. is a volume of extracts from it, made by Dr. Birch, about 1746, and in one of these reference is made to our Countess:—

“Table-Book of Robert Sydney, second Earl of Leycester, written when Ambassador at Paris, about 1640, page 71.

“The old Countess of Desmond was a married woman in Edw. IV.'s time of England, and lived till towards the end of Q. Elizabeth, so as she must needs be neare 140 yeares old. She had a new sett of teeth not long afore her death, and might have lived much longer had she not mett with a kinde of violent death; for she would needs climbe a nut-tree, to gather nuts; so falling down she hurt her thigh, which brought a fever, and that fever brought death. This my cosin, Walter Fitzwilliam, told me.

“This old lady, Mr. Haniot told me, came to petition the queen, and, landing at Bristoll, she came on foot to London, being then so old

that her daughter was decipit, and not able to come with her, but was brought in a little cart, theyr poverty not allowing meanes for better provision: and, as I remember, Sir Walter Rawleigh in some part of his story speakes of her, and sayth that he saw her in England in anno 1589. Her death was strange and remarkable, as her long life was, having seen the death of so many descended of her, and both her own and her husband's house ruined in the rebellions and wars."

I am indebted for this extract to my friend, John Gough Nichols, who appends a note that Sir Walter Raleigh did not say that he saw her in England in 1589, but that she was living in 1589, and many years since.

As Lord John Hay prefaced an anecdote to a brother of mine:—"It is a verra cur'os fac', but it *is* a fac'," that though this remembrance of Lord Leycester's having read what Sir Walter Raleigh never printed is part of an unbroken pargraph, the writers who quote my lord's record of gossip stop short at his remembrance, and omit any mention of it. One might have thought that what the earl remembered to have read was at least equal in authority to what he remembered to have heard. But whether Lord Leycester gives us the gossip of my cousin Fitzwilliam, or of Mr. Hanriot, or his own remembrance of what Sir Walter Raleigh sayth, he is clear, consistent, and uniform on one point,—that it was to Queen Elizabeth the old Countess came, and sought redress and relief. Now, Lord Leycester *is the only authority we have* that the Countess did appear at the English court seeking redress and relief, and on his authority we are required to believe that she did so. But having laid this down as history, we are then told, and required equally to believe, that our historian was mistaken as to the time of the Countess's crossing the sea, which, say they, occurred in the reign of James I. For this change of the venue, however, not a scintilla of evidence is offered; and while they endorse the earl on his opening gossip, they imperiously contradict him on the remainder. Lord Leycester wrote thirty-six years after the death of the Countess, and now, 120 years subsequent to the penning of his notable history, we are to receive their amendment of his conclusion on their mere assertion. Surely, if he knew little in 1640, they know less in 1860. He had the tittle-tattle of his day, but they have only his, and of this they choose to make '*a mingle-mangle*'\* of their own. To admit the change of the supposed pilgrimage of the Countess from the reign of Queen Elizabeth to that of King James on their no-authority, would indeed be transforming what they claim as history into fiction, but still requiring it to be accepted as history,—accepting Kenilworth as correcting Edward VI.'s diary.

The MS. "Bib. Cotton, Nero. c. 10, p. 55, Plut 6, D," in the British Museum, is King Edward VI.'s Diary or Journal of his reign, entirely in his own handwriting, and from which I copied this extract:—

---

\* Latimer's Third Sermon before Edward VI., March 22, 1549.

"1550. June 4.—S. Robert Dudeley, third sonne to th' erle of Warwic, married S. Jon Robsarte's daughter, after which mariage ther were certain gentlemen that did strive who should first take away a goses heade, wich was hanged alive on tow crose postes.\*

"5. Ther was tilt and tornay on foot, w<sup>t</sup> as great staves as the run w'al on horsbake."

That the Countess went over to England in her latter days is brought before us as an historical fact; and no counter-authority being even referred to, Lord Leycester's narrative must be taken altogether as he has given it to us, or rejected altogether. We, therefore, now enter on the examination of the question as the Earl of Leicester has laid it down,—Did the old Countess of Desmond repair to the court of Queen Elizabeth, seeking redress and relief?

We must first collect such scattered notices as we can respecting her that bear on our inquiry.

We are indebted to the extensive researches of the widely-informed writer in the "Quarterly" for one article of very material importance. At page 342, he writes:—"A MS. state paper, dated 1589, enumerates among the forfeitures of the attainted Garrett 'the castle and manor of Inchiquin, *now in the hands* of Dame Katherine Fitz John, late wyfe to Thomas, sometyme Earl of Desmond, for terme of lyef, as for hir dower.' The desolated possessions of the rebel had been given away, the grantees undertaking to settle English colonists in the land; but having failed in this engagement, they were now called on to fulfil it. Sir Walter Raleigh, who was in this category, after specifying the leases he had made, thus concludes his rejoinder:—"There remaines unto me but an old castle and demayne, which are yet in occupation of the old Countess of Desmond for her jointure.'"

No reference is given where this state MS. is preserved, and I have been unsuccessful in searching for it. I accept with the most perfect assurance the extracts in the "Quarterly;" but I wished to know the whole contents of the document. In looking for it at the State-paper Office, London, we met with some very interesting papers respecting the Countess Ellynor, widow of the rebel Earl Garrett, which will be appended to the present inquiry. An opinion has been expressed that they may have given rise to the Earl of Leycester's gossip; but that is no concern of mine.

This MS. State paper, it is to be remembered, is an official document, addressed to Queen Elizabeth's government (most probably to Mr. Secretary Walsingham), and by it the forfeited estates of the Earl of Desmond are returned to the crown, in 1589, as legally charged with a jointure to our Countess; and Sir Walter Raleigh, in his rejoinder,

---

\* The goose was hung by its legs, the head downwards, at a height only to be reached by the "gentlemen," riding at full speed, springing up from the saddle, and getting such a clutch at the goose's neck as to drag its head off. According to our modern notions, the twenty-four blackbirds, who all began to sing when the baked pie was opened, were a prettier sight to set before a king.

equally official, states that the Countess then occupied "the castle and demayne" of Inchiquin in her legal right of jointure.

In the Calendar of the Patent Rolls of Ireland of James I., printed by the Record Commission, page 37, we have the enrollment of the deed of sale by Sir Walter Raleigh of his Irish property to the afterwards great Earl of Cork :—

"CXXIV.—41. Deed dated 7 Dec. 1602, 45<sup>th</sup> Eliz. between Sir Walter Raleigh, Kn<sup>t</sup>, Captain of the Queen's Guard, Lord Warden of the Stannaries in Devon and Cornwall co<sup>t</sup>, and Governor of Jersey isle and castle, and Richard Boyle, esq., Clerk of the Council in Munster, being a native of England, whereby Sir Walter, in consideration of 500<sup>l</sup> Eng. before hand paid, 500<sup>l</sup> to be paid at Michaelmas 1603, and 500<sup>l</sup> to be paid at Easter 1604, demised to said Boyle the lands following."

After reciting the lands and all other rights, &c., "the inheritance of the said Sir Walter in Ireland" follows, "excepting the lands, &c., which are stated in a schedule annexed to this indenture, to have been sold or leased, in fee-farm, or for a term of years,—To hold for ever," &c.

By this deed, enrolled no doubt by Mr. Boyle for his own security, we have this recorded proof, that his legal powers on the property were subject to Sir Walter's previous leasing, &c. Then follows, at p. 38 :—

"CXXV.—45. Schedule of Deeds, &c., referred to in the preceding grant," among which is, "To John Cleaver, Gent., a plowland called Covlid-clofyma, and other lands : 21 July, 30<sup>th</sup> Eliz."

To the Rev. Samuel Hayman, of Youghal, whose history of that borough, from its earliest period to the present, records an accumulation of interesting facts which the most laborious and judicious researches only could have dug out of the dusty and mouldering manuscripts of past ages, I am greatly indebted for his very kind permission to make extracts from a copy which Mr. Hayman made from one original counterpart of this lease to Mr. Cleaver, granted by Sir Walter Raleigh, of lands on which evidently the old Countess had a first, but only a life charge ; as on her death the rent payable to Sir Walter doubled, and the tenant was then also to provide for Sir Walter Raleigh's service an efficient lighthorse-man and equipments. It is amusing also to remark the implied expectation that the Countess's life would not extend to five years beyond the date of the lease ; and, as we suppose she was then 124, the expectation was not very extraordinary. She did, however, live for sixteen years longer, we may be quite certain, much to the satisfaction of the tenant.

*Extracts from Sir Walter Raleigh's Lease of Coullie Clofina.*

"This Indenture made the one and twentieth day of July, in the thirtieth yeare of y<sup>e</sup> reign of o<sup>r</sup> Sou'aign Ladie Elizabeth by the grace of God, of England, France, and Ireland, Queene, Defender of the Faith, &c., Between the honorable Sir Walter Raleigh, Knight, Lord Warden of her Ma<sup>ties</sup> Stannaries in ye Counties of Devon and Cornwall, & one of the principal undertakers with her Ma<sup>ties</sup> for ye repeoplinge & inhabitinge



ye Attainted & excheated lands in ye Counties of Cork and Waterford, in ye Province of Munster, in her highnes Realme of Ireland of thone ptie. And John Clever of London Gentleman of thother ptie, Witnesseth, that the said Sir Walter Raleigh for divers good causes and reasonable considerations, &c., doth demise graunte betake & and to farme lett unto the said John Clever, All that Ploughland commonly called or known by the name of Coullie Clofinia, sett and beinge within the Barony of Inchequyn in ye Countie of Corke aforesaid with foure hundred acres of arrable land & ferme wodes thereunto belonginge, &c. &c. (But reserving to Sir Walter Raleigh the Royalties and all wracks of the sea that happen within the same premises.) To have and to hold all and singular the same demised premises and every pcell thereof with the appurtenances, (except as before excepted,) unto the said John Clever, his Executors and Assigns, from the feast of Sainct Michael Th' Arch-aungell next ensuinge the date hercof unto thend and tearme of one hundred yeares from thence next ensuinge and fully to be compleat and ended, yelding and payinge therefor yearely during three of the said yeares (viz) from thend of the yeare of our Lord God w<sup>ch</sup> shall be One Thousand five hundred foure score, and nine, and from and after the decease of the Ladie Cattelyn, old Countesse Dowager of Desmond Widowe, until thend of the yeare of our Lord God w<sup>ch</sup> shalbe (1593,) unto the said Sir Walter Raleigh, his heires or Assignes, five pounds of good and lawful money of England at two feasts or tearmes of the yeare, that is to say at the feaste of Thannunciation of our Ladie St. Mary the Virgin, and St. Michael Tharchaungel, by even portions, and also fower Capons or Hennes, at the feasts of Easter and Christmas, if they be demaded AND ALSO yeldinge and payinge therfor yearely unto the said Sir Walter Raleigh his heires or Assignes during the residue of ye said terme begynnynne from and after ye Decease of ye said Countesse, and after thend of the said year of o<sup>r</sup> lord God which shalbe (1593) the yearly rent of Tenne Pounds of lawful money of England at the said two feasts of th Annunciation of o<sup>r</sup> Ladie St Mary the Virgine and St Michael Tharchaungell w<sup>ch</sup> of them shall first happen after the death of the said Countesse, and after thend of the said yeare of o<sup>r</sup> Lord God (1593) the first payment therof shall begyne, and also fower capons or hennes at the feasts of Easter and Christmas, if they be demanded. *And if it shall happen eyther the said yearely Rents of five Pounds or tenne pounds, to be behind and unpaid, &c., &c. And the said John Clever for himself, &c., &c., covennteth & graunteth to & with the said Sir Walter Raleigh his heires and Assignes by theis pnts to find from tyme to tyme after the decease of the said Countesse, and after the end of the said yeare of o<sup>r</sup> Lord God wh<sup>ch</sup> shalbe (1593) a sufficient light horse man and furniture, to him the said Sir Walter Raleigh his heires and assignes, in the affaires of the Crowne of Ireland."*

[Mr. Cleaver then further covenants to build a mansion or dwelling house in and upon the same premises; and also to enclose with hedge, ditch, and quicke sett one hundred acres at least of the same premises; and to pay a further rent of one penny per acre for boggy, mountaine,

or barren heath, converted into good ground, should y<sup>e</sup> Queenes Ma<sup>ty</sup> demand one farthing or halfpenny per Acre of Sir Walter Raleigh for the improved land.]

“IN WITNESS whereof the said Pties to theis Pnt Indentures, interchaungablie have putt their hands and Seales, YEoven the day and yeare first above written (Anno Dni) 1588.

“W. RALEIGH.”

—*From the original lease, copied by S. H.*

The manor of Inchiquin is now the property of Lord Ponsonby, and among his Lordship's muniments is the copy of a subsequent lease of Sir Walter Raleigh's, of another part of the manor, in which the rights of the Old Countess are equally recognized, but with the same implied certainty that her life was not to extend beyond, A. D. 1593, if indeed so long.

“This indenture, made the 1st day of February, in the one-and-thirtieth year\* of the reign of our Sovereign Lady Elizabeth, by the grace of God, Queen of England, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c, Between the Honorable Sir Walter Raleigh, Knight, Lord Warden of the Stannaries in the counties of Devon and Cornewell, one of the principall undertakers with Her Majestie, for the repeopleing and inhabitinge escheated lands in the counties of Corke and Waterford, in the province of Munster, in Her Highnes realme of Ireland of the one partie, and Robert Reve of Bury Sainte Edmonds in the countie of Suff. gentleman, and Alice his wife of the other partie witnesseth, that the said Sir Walter Raleigh, &c., &c., &c., dothe give, grant, enfeoffe, and confirme unto the said Robert Reve and Alice his wife, all and singular the lands, tenements, and hereditaments whatsoever, called and knowne by the name of the Plougheland of Coullye Ffoina, within the barony of Inchequyn Raleigh in the countie of Corke aforesaide. And also if there be not 400 acres of arable grounde in Coullye Ffoina aforesaid, (the said 400 acres to be measured by the standard of England), then the said Sir Walter Raleigh hath given &c., &c., to the said Robert Reve and Alice his wife, so many acres of arrable grounde next adjoining, either in Cloyne, Ardes, or in Poull Moore, &c., &c., as shall make up the full number of 400 acres, &c., &c., &c. To have and to holde &c., &c., to the only use and behoofe of the said Robert Reve and Alice his wife, their heirs and assigns for ever, &c., &c., &c. Yieldinge and paying therefore yearly from and after the decease of y<sup>e</sup> Lady Cattelyn oulde Countess Dowager of Desmond, Widdoue, and from and after the end of the year of our Lord God, which shall be one thousand five hundred ffourscore and nyne, untill the end of the year of our Lord God, which shall be, one thousand ffive hundred and ffourscore and thirteen, five pounds of lawful money of England, at two feasts or termes in the year, that is to saie, at the feasts of Sainte Michael the Archaungell, and the Annunciation of our Lady Sainte Mary the Virgin by even and equal portions, the first paymente thereof to begin at either of the said feasts, which of

---

\* 1589.

them shall first happen after the death of the said Lady Cattelyn, old Countess Dowager of Desmond, and after the end of the said year of our said Lord God, which shall be one thousand five hundred and ten, &c., &c. And yielding and paying from and after the decease of the said Countess, and after the end of the said year of our said Lord God, which shall be one thousand five hundred fourscore and thirteen, the yearly rent of £10, of lawful English money, at the said two feasts, &c., &c., the first payment thereof to begin at either of the said feasts, which of them shall first happen, after the death of the said Countess, and after the end of the said year of our Lord God which shall be, one thousand five hundred fourscore and thirteen, &c., &c. And the said Robert Reve for himself, &c., &c., doth covenant, &c., with the said Sir Walter Raleigh, &c., by these presents, to find from time to time, after the decease of the said Countess, and after the end of the said year of our Lord God, which shall be one thousand five hundred fourscore and thirteen, a light horseman and furniture serviceable, to serve the said Sir Walter Raleigh and his heirs, in the affairs of the Crown of England, or otherwise in defence of the country, against private or public enemies."

Those who so far accept Lord Leycester's gossip, that the Countess was driven to England, but, on their own authority, place the event in a different reign from their historian, account for the necessity of her appearing personally at the English court, by assuming that her right of jointure was disturbed by Earl Garrett's attainder; that Sir Walter Raleigh generously allowed her to remain in the receipt of it, but that she was ousted from her residence and rents by Mr. Boyle (subsequently the celebrated Earl of Cork), when he purchased Sir Walter Raleigh's Irish estates; and that as she had come into the jointure in 1534, the English government passed her rights over, as considering them long extinct. The latter supposition has no ground to stand on; for, as the "Quarterly" shows us, the English government only became acquainted in 1589 that *a* Countess of Desmond, but not *the* rebel's wife, had the lien of a jointure on the forfeited estates. Its legality was admitted; and as Queen Elizabeth died March 24, 1603, in whose reign the Earl of Leycester states that the Countess went over—and I must repeat that the earl is the only authority there is that she ever left her castle of Inchiquin—the period in which the event, had it happened, could have occurred, was only fourteen years; during which time neither Elizabeth nor her ministers would have lost their recollection of her admitted legal right of jointure, connected as it was with such an important affair as the escheated Desmond estates, of which Fynes Moryson, at part ii., book i., chap. i., pages 4 and 5, gives the granting away to undertakers of 237,672 acres, reserving a yearly rent to the crown of £2,272 18s. 6d.; and the restoration to others of 336,956 acres; the whole forfeited by the earl and his confederates being 574,628 English acres. And with this acquiescence of Queen Elizabeth's government to the legal right of the old Countess Dowager to her jointure on the forfeited Desmond estates, I cannot sup-

pose that any lawyer would admit the Earl of Leicester's *gossip* to be worth a moment's consideration.

Be that as it may, Sir Walter Raleigh's lease to John Cleaver, and the lease to Robert Reve, clearly establish that the Countess then held her jointure by public acknowledged legal right, and not by sufferance or generosity. Her life-interest in the lands let by Raleigh to Cleaver and Reve are equally recognized by the lessor and the lessee, the landlord requiring, and the tenants engaging, to pay double rent, and to furnish and maintain a light-horseman after the decease of the old Countess Cattelyn, which we may fairly presume was considered by both parties equivalent to the interest which the Countess had in these lands: therefore, whenever Mr. Boyle purchased Sir Walter Raleigh's estates, he took them subject to this lease; and there is not the slightest shadow of evidence (supposing the Countess was then living) that he made any attempt to disturb what these papers prove was her acknowledged legal rights; for this supposed eviction is only another of the assumptions to support Lord Leycester's gossip; but if Mr. Boyle had made the attempt, he would have been also resisted by the London tenant, Mr. Cleaver, who had a beneficial interest in the continuance of her life-interest, and, being close to the English court, was not a person to be injured with impunity.

From "CALENDAR OF STATE PAPERS, DOMESTIC SERIES, JAMES I. 1603-1610." London, 1857.

*Page 146.—Release to Richard Boyle for a payment of a debt of £1000 for Sir Walter Raleigh, 1604, Aug. 26.—[Ind. W. & B. H.], page 41. —Calendar of Irish Patent Rolls, James 1<sup>st</sup>, page 41, 10<sup>th</sup> May, 2<sup>nd</sup> [year of reign, 1604].—Grant from the King to Sir Richard Boyle, Kt.*

This is a confirmation of Sir Walter Raleigh's deed of sale of his Irish estates to R<sup>d</sup> Boyle, Esq<sup>r</sup> for £1500; of which £500 was paid beforehand, £500 was to be paid at Michaelmas, 1603, and £500 to be paid at Easter, 1604; but Sir Walter being (justly or otherwise) attainted for treason against James I., Sir Richard Boyle, as we see, paid the two sums of £500 to the Crown, and very wisely got a grant of his purchase direct from the King. This grant commences with the barony, manor, and castle of Inchiquin; and among the denominations is that of "Cooly-Clough-Finnagh," clearly the land let by Sir W. R. to Mr. Cleaver, shewing that it was part of the old Countess Kathrin's jointure-lands.

In the enrolment of Sir Walter Raleigh's sale of his Irish estates to Richard Boyle, Esq., Rot. Pat. 1<sup>o</sup>, James I., p. 37-38, is a schedule annexed of all the leases granted by Sir W. R., 33 in number; the first dated 18th February, 30th Eliz. (1588), the last 27 May, 40th Eliz. (1598). The fourth lease in date is "To John Cleaver, gent., a ploughland called Coolid Clodyma, and other lands, 21st July, 30th Eliz." The deed of sale is dated 7th December, 1602, 45th Eliz. We have there-

fore in this roll the highest legal evidence that, fourteen years subsequent to its date, the existing validity of Cleaver's lease, preserving the old Countess's rights, is stipulated by Sir W. R. who sells, and recognized by Mr. Boyle, who purchases the property ; and that Mr. Boyle enrolled his purchase in 1603, the new King, James I., being then on the throne, whose ministers (the same persons, be it remembered, who were Queen Elizabeth's) are assumed by the Earl of Leicester's followers, "to have overlooked the old jointuress of seventy years' possession, and in issuing the new patent to have ignored the poor old widow;" they themselves overlooking and ignoring that, so late as 1589, on their own shewing, these very ministers had admitted the Countess Kathrin's legal possession of the jointure lande.

From "*Memoirs of the illustrious Family of the Boyles, Dublin, 1754.*"  
Pages 13 and 14.

The Lord President of Munster, Sir George Carey (Carew), after the taking of Beer Haven Castle from the Spaniards, "told Mr. Boyle that he resolved to send him into England, to obtain leave from her Majesty that he himself might repair to her royal presence, and give her a full account of the posture of her affairs in Ireland. At the same time he advised him to buy all Sir Walter Raleigh's lands in Munster, and offered to befriend him in the purchase. Accordingly, when he dispatch'd him for England, he sent two letters by him : one of these was directed to Sir Robert Cecill, Secretary of State, in which he gave a very advantageous account of Mr. Boyle's great abilities, and of the services he had done his country ; in consideration of which, he desired the Secretary would introduce him to Sir Walter Raleigh, and recommend him to that great man, as a proper purchaser for all his lands in Ireland, if he was disposed to part with them. The Lord President's other letter was directed to Sir Walter himself, acquainting him that the bearer, Mr. Boyle, was a person capable of purchasing all his estate in Ireland, which he presumed he would be glad to dispose of, since the management of it in those troublesome times gave him a great deal of trouble, and the income it produced was very inconsiderable. These letters occasioned a meeting between Sir Robert Cecill, Sir Walter Raleigh, and Mr. Boyle ; at which the two last, by the mediation of the first, soon struck up a bargain, and proper conveyances were executed between them. These lands, though they had yielded but little to Sir Walter Raleigh, became soon after (when the war in Ireland was fully ended) a very noble estate to Mr. Boyle, who had purchased them. 'And this (says he in his Memoirs, when he was Earl of Cork) was a third addition and rise to my estate.'"

From *Calendar Irish Patent Rolls, James I., page 41, 10 May 2nd [year of reign, 1604]*.—*Grant from the King to Sir Richard Boyle, Kt.*

This is a confirmation of Sir Walter Raleigh's deed of sale, Sir Richard paying the King the two sums of £500, which he was to have

paid to Sir Walter Raleigh in 1603 and 1604. The grant commences with the barony, manor, and castle of Inchiquin; and among its denominations is that of Cooly-Clogh-Finnagh, clearly the land let by Sir Walter to Mr. Cleaver, and shewing that it was part of the jointure-lands of the old Countess Kathrin.

I submit that I have now shown legal proof that the Countess could not have been disturbed in the enjoyment of her jointure, and I entirely acquit the Earl of Cork from the groundless aspersion of having even attempted to deprive her of it.

We will now take into consideration the negative evidence, deduced from the notices of the old Countess of Desmond in the works of Sir Walter Raleigh, Lord Bacon, and Fynes Moryson.

From Sir Walter Raleigh's "History of the World," book 1., chap. v., sec. 5, folio edition, 1614, p. 66:—

"I myself knew the old Countess of Desmond, of Inchiquin in Munster, who lived in the year 1589, and many years since, who was married in Edward IV.'s time, and held her jointure from all the Earls of Desmond since then; and that this is true all the Noblemen and Gentlemen of Munster can witness."

Lord Bacon twice notices the Countess; but it appears to me clearly that in both instances he derives his information almost entirely from Fynes Moryson, whose "Itinerary" was published six years previous to Lord Bacon's earliest mention of her, which is in his "*Historia Vitæ et Mortis*." London: 8vo, 1623:—

"*Hiberni præsertim sylvestres, etiam adhuc sunt valde vivaces: certe aiunt, paucis abhinc annis Comitissam Desmondiæ vixisse ad annum centissimum quadragesimum, Et ter per vices dentiisse. Hibernis autem mos est se nudos ante focum butyro salso et veteri fricare et quasi condire.*"

[The Irish, particularly those who live in the country, even now, are very long lived. They say for certain that within these few years the Countess of Desmond lived to her 140th year, and cast her teeth three times. But it is a custom with the Irish, placing themselves naked before a fire, to rub, and as it were season, their bodies with old salt butter.]

On the latter part of this extract I may remark, that although Lord Bacon's rule of inductive philosophy did not allow him to express an opinion on what he had not witnessed and tested, yet the passage is evidently given as a probable explanation of the means by which the Countess's years were so wonderfully extended; and with this great philosopher's implied conviction, considering it in a mercantile point of view, it would seem very desirable that the medical body should carefully test this prescription and practice of the olden time: for should it prove so greatly conducive to longevity, not only would the faculty benefit, and a serious stimulus be given to the production of butter, but the class of butter which is now almost valueless, that which has over-

stood the market, would, by being stored for some years, become of more value than 'New Rose'\* of the present year, and brands of fifteen or twenty years past rival in price and attraction vintages of the same dates, while tubs of bog-butter would literally prove nuggets of gold!

Should these possibilities become realities, though this paper may fail in its intended purpose, it will not have been written in vain.

With, however, that conscientious impartiality that all historic inquiries should command, I feel bound to state that this implied opinion of Lord Bacon is directly impugned by the present representatives of old Thomas Parr, who in the "Life" they have published of him (we are to presume from his original documents) state, "that during Parr's stay with the Earl of Arundel he was introduced to the celebrated Countess of Desmond, to whom, it is believed, Parr gave a supply of the medicine by which he maintained his vigour to such an extreme period of life; and this is extremely probable, as the Countess lived to the amazing age of 145 years."

We are thus called to exercise our judgment between a fact implied and a fact probable,—the rival merits of an outward application on the human frame of animal matter, and an inward action on the human frame of vegetable matter—between the butter firkin and the pill-box. The result is immaterial to my inquiry; and, unconscious of bias, I must say, I think that the firkin carries most weight.

Lord Bacon's next notice is in his "*Sylva Sylvarum*; or, A Natural History in ten Centuries." London: folio, 1627; page 194, century 8, "Experiments in consort touching Teeth," No. 755.—"They tell a Tale of the old Countess of Desmond, who lived till she was seven score years old, that she did dentire twice or thrice: casting her old Teeth, and others coming in their place."

We now pass on to Fynes Moryson's visiting Youghal in 1613, and note what he learned there respecting the Old Countess, then dead. And it will be observed, that Lord Bacon is entirely indebted to Moryson for the information of the Countess's age, and renewing of her teeth. Sir Walter Raleigh only mentions her being married in the reign of Edward IV., and this era accords with her reported age at Youghal. I think the two, but quite dissimilar, notices mutually support and confirm each other.

From "Fynes Moryson, his Ten Yeeres' Travel," &c., folio. London, 1617, Part ii., Book iii., chap. ii., p. 299. "Ireland."—"In the yeere 1613, by the intreaty of my brother Sir Richard Moryson (Vice-President of Mounster), and out of my desire to see his children God had given him in Ireland (besides some occasions of my private estate), I was drawne over againe into Ireland, where we landed the ninth of September, miraculously preserved from shipwrack. For at nine of the night, (beinge darke at that time of the yeere), we fell upon the coast of Ireland, and not well knowing the coast, but imagin-

---

\* The highest brand in the Cork butter market.

ing it to be Yoghall Port, we tacked about, to beate out at Sea, the night following. But having some howers before sprung a Leake, and our Pumpes being foule, so as they would not worke, we had no hope to live so longe at sea, and againe not knowing the coast, wee durst not venture to put in upon it, besides that in case it were Yoghall Harbour, our best fortune was to enter a barrd Haven by night. In this distress by Divine Providence, we were preserved, the Moone breaking out through the dispersed clouds, and shining so bright, as our best Marines easily discovered the Harbour of Yoghall, and the tide serving happily, we passed the barre into the same. And the next morning we might see the danger we had escaped most apparent; for our ship was so farre unable to indure the waves of the sea, with her great leake and the foulness of the Pumpes, (if we had been forced to keepe aboard till the next daies light might make us know the coast,) as the same night she had sunke in the quiet Harbour, if the Marriners had not chosen rather to drive her on ground."

Part iii., Book i., chap. iii., page 43. "Opinions of Nations. Long Life."—"The Irish report, and will sweare it, that towards the West, they have an Iland, wherein the Inhabitants live so long, as when they are weary and burthened with life, their children in charity bring them to die upon the shoare of Ireland, as if their Iland would not permit them to die. In our time the Irish Countesse of Desmond, lived to the age of about 140 yeeres, being able to goe on foote foure or five miles to the Market Towne, and using weekly so to doe in her last yeeres, and not many yeeres before shee died, shee had all her teeth renewed."

Our first concern now is to get the old Countess and her decrepit daughter, the former walking, the latter in a little cart, up from Bristol to London, at some period of some year intervening between 1589, when Sir Walter Raleigh knew her at Inchiquin, and 1603, when Queen Elizabeth died.

As her daughter may have been 120 years of age, we may allow her to have been decrepit, and that she required the little cart; but the question naturally arises, why did she accompany her mother? Scarcely as a protectress. The pedigree of the Desmonds, given by the "Quarterly," states, that the old Countess's only child, a daughter, was married to Philip Barry Oge; and as her father, Earl Thomas, had a son and grandson, her marriage portion would have been in money. Earl Garrett, in 1574, when making the feofment of his estates, settles "the sum of one thousand pounds to the preferment of evrie of my daughters, which at the time of my death shall not be preferred."—Cotton MSS., Titus, B. xiii., page 195.

The Countess herself had only a life-interest in the jointure, consequently neither on her own nor on her mother's right could Mrs. Philip Barry Oge have any claim on government. If the Countess had been decrepit, and the daughter, at the age of 120, strong and courageous, we should have to admire filial piety braving all dangers. But my Lord Leicester's narrative reverses all this, and we commence with the absurdity of the Countess encumbering herself with a helpless companion, for no



earthly purpose; but so my lord wills, and we depart from Bristol, Mrs. Barry in her little cart, and Dame Katherin trudging on the road-side. But why walk, with only one in the cart? It is hard to fancy such a tiny vehicle that would not allow room for two old ladies. Or, when it had to be purchased, why had not one been selected that would accommodate two? Well, as our heroine now takes to the tramp, what time are we to allow for the journey, say about 120 miles? When at Inchiquin, once a week she walked eight or ten miles, but the present, we infer, was daily continuous walking. What the state of the roads then were, it is not easy for us to imagine, when eighty years ago the coach from London to Hitchen, distance thirty-four miles, took twelve hours to get over the ground. Thus far we have considered the difficulties. Come we now to dangers. The insecurity on the English roads is of historic notoriety. Latimer, preaching before Edward VI., 22nd March, 1549, touches on the subject in terms which evince how general it was—"What, princes, thieves? Had they a standing at Shooter's Hill, or Standgate Hole to take a purse? Did they stand by the highway side? Did they rob or break open any man's house? No, no; that is a gross kind of thieving. They were princes; they had a prince-like kind of thieving. They all love bribes."

As to the unsafety of the English high roads at the end of Queen Elizabeth's reign, we have the contemporary evidence of Fynes Moryson. In his *Precepts for Travellers*, Part iii., Book i., after detailing the dangers of foreign travel, at page 28 we come to those at home—"Theeves in England are more common than in any other place, so far as I have observed or heard, but having taken purses by the highway, they seldome or never kill those they rob." In the preceding page, Germany, he recommends the stranger, if assaulted by thieves, to "defend himselfe the best hee can, for they alwaies kill those whom they rob." So that, while the purse was in greater danger in England than anywhere else, life was less so. Rather cold comfort for our old Countess and her decrepit daughter; but still some, comparatively. Under any circumstances, whether continuous or at intervals, the Countess's walk from Bristol to London would have required twelve days at least; and with Morryson's report as to the abundance of "thieves," there can be no doubt these "unprotected females" would have been plundered a dozen times successively, if the first gentlemen of the road who met them had left them anything but their skins; and when eased of their money, little cart, and horse, if not of most of their clothes, how were they to proceed on their journey to London? If Lord Leycester had studied how to compose a tissue of deepening improbabilities, I do not think he could have exceeded those I have now submitted for consideration, and so we dismiss this part of his gossip. It is difficult in these days to realize to our thoughts the discomforts and dangers of travelling in England, even at the close of the last century. In the very neighbourhood of London, at that time, no person unarmed could pass with any safety over Hounslow Heath (across which the Bristol road to London ran), Bagshot Heath, Shooter's Hill, Standgate Hole, Finchley Common, and Wim-

bledon Common, which were amongst the most notoriously dangerous localities. I was at school near Finchley, and remember one of two highwaymen who stopped the carriage of a traveller being shot dead. At length, about 1815, armed horse patrol took charge of the roads, and the evil was abated.\*

Such difficulties and dangers had they ever really been encountered, our travellers in the little cart and on foot would have had their pilgrimage ended for them somewhere on the Bristol road, a long way from London. But Lord Lecyester wields a magician's rod, and as in its power they are brought safely to London, roads and robbers notwithstanding, we must per force attend their steps—a veracious chronicler,—and, as best we may, faithfully record how the Countess prospered in her suit.

Remembering that they landed at Bristol in great poverty, and had been at least a fortnight on the journey, the purse could not but have become fearfully light. Consequently, she must look round for assistance; and, most fortunately, her friend, Sir Walter Raleigh, who had shared her hospitality at Inchiquin Castle in 1589, was now stationary in London, high in favour at court, and, in addition to previous preferments, had become captain of the guard to the queen, and so continued during Elizabeth's reign. Of course, the Countess bent her steps to his residence, “claimed kindred there, and had her claims allowed.” We have seen, by Sir Walter's lease of 1588, that he not only acknowledged, but guarded her legal claims on the lands he let to Mr. Cleaver. No person, therefore, could be better acquainted with her rights; and few at that period had more court influence to assert them than the warrior, statesman, and philosopher; and, be it told to his honour, that he instantly and heartily took up her cause, and fought her battle with all his heart and head.

---

\* Since writing this paper, I find my statement of the dangers of travelling at this time most fully borne out by an article in the “Gentleman's Magazine” for January, 1861, founded on the records of the county of Middlesex of the sixteenth century, p. 31.

Unfortunately this reprehensible course had been followed by men whose after eminence gave peculiar eclat to such depravity, and rendered it difficult for the popular mind to regard a gentleman highwayman with the same feelings that would have been shown to an ordinary thief. Eminent courtiers had been recognised, in spite of their masked faces, on the road: even the dignity of justice was marred by the fact that some of her administrators had, in their youth, followed such vicious ways. Sir Roger Cholmeley and Sir Edward Popham were both said to have occasionally practised as gentlemen highwaymen. A party of wild young fellows being taken before Chief Justice Cholmeley, one of them had the effrontery to remind the judge of his early irregularities.

“Indeed,” answered he, “in youth I was as you are now, and I had twelve fellows, like unto myself; but not one of them came unto a good end, and, therefore, follow not my example in youth, but follow my counsel in age, if ever ye think to cum to this place, or to these years that I am cum unto, lest you meet with povertie, or Tibburne on the way.”

“With bad roads and dense thickets yet skirting the suburban thoroughfares, the pursuits of the highwayman were unattended with much danger. He had few risks, and had little fear of interruption.”

Would that the chronicler\* of the Countess's youthful court days had survived, or that his mantle had descended to a kindred spirit, to record the scene, when, at Sir Walter's powerful intercession, he was permitted to bring his friend, the old Countess Cattelyn to the foot of the throne, there humbly to supplicate her dread Sovereign's grace and favour for the redress of wrongs, and the restitution of her jointure, manors, and castle. Try—how vain soever the attempt—try to picture the excitement, the wonder, and the curiosity of the court of Elizabeth, at the appearance of this almost, as would seem, antediluvian lady. A belle of the White Rose era, a dynasty dethroned by the Tudors, time long since out of mind. Yet the knowledge of the gay splendour of Edward IV.'s revels had come down to them, as those of Charles II. have come down to us; and to really look on one who had shone in its dances, a partner with Royalty! And with these thoughts, a sigh may have arisen from many a fair damsel, as she contrasted in her mind the traditional, unchecked mirth and freedom of Edward's palace with the stately and severe ceremonial of the Virgin Queen's. Nor is it unlikely that in the circle were some bold turbulent spirits whose minds reverted to the up and stirring times of the wars of the White and Red Roses, when the conquering swords (always our own), carved out for their owners the rich domains of the vanquished. Neither can we doubt, as Sir Walter recounted the wrongs of the old Countess to the Queen, that the blood of many a gallant youth boiled up indignantly, while he fervently wished—and would have intreated, had he dared—that his Sovereign Lady, the great Gloriana of chivalry, would select him as her Arthegall,† to restore Inchiquin to its venerable owner, and inflict stern justice on the felon oppressor. What, too, may not have been the thoughts of the old Countess herself, actually comparing the rich gaiety of the past with the stiff splendour of the present,—Elizabeth Wydeville with Elizabeth Tudor,—a queen Consort in company with her handsome, voluptuous husband, their bevy of lovely daughters, fast rising into womanhood, equally promising sons, on both sides bands of relatives, and so circumstanced, with no other feelings than the enjoyment of the surrounding gaiety with a Queen Regnant, the last in direct line of the Tudors, choosing to stand alone in the world, not even to acknowledge a successor; and in a stormy political period, charged with the safety of an empire, whose cares the vigilance of no gentleman usher could exclude even from the presence chamber: while to Elizabeth herself the suppliant must have had a yet more thrilling interest, only short, we may believe, to the appearance of a spirit from the realms of the departed. Before her was a friend and companion of Elizabeth of York, by her brother's death the rightful heiress of the Plantagenet crown, and through whose blood Elizabeth Tudor now lawfully wore it. Think also of the suit, an appeal to the justice of the Sovereign for the restoration of a jointure which

---

\* Commines.

† 5th Booke of Spenser's "*Faery Queene*," the legend of Arthegall, or Justice.

commenced when Elizabeth was an infant nestling on her mother's breast. Look, a little to the right of the dais; there stands the Queen's prime minister, the younger Cecil, on whom, next to the Sovereign Ladye, every eye is bent, and to whom every knee sinks: secure of his present greatness during this reign, with its reversion equally so for the next, whose expectant rests on Cecil alone to obtain the throne, and when obtained to keep it—and Cecil did both. How observantly tranquil is that keenly penetrating countenance! What may be the within of this splendid exterior, the hopeless envy of so many around? A weakly body, a wearied mind, a saddened spirit. Seek we his own estimate of the scene in which he figures only second? Walk into the Mausoleum he added to Hatfield Church as an earthly resting-place for himself and descendants; and you stand, as I have done, before his tomb, most probably executed in his life-time, a circumstance of frequent occurrence later than his period.\*

Can we suppose that, as Cecil's attention rested on the kneeling Countess, the sight could fail awakening trains of thought and comparisons of difference? Her vital stamina, which had upheld its frame for a period doubling the allotted life of man, and who had passed her fourscore ere his parents were united in marriage, yet seemed at this moment more vigorous in health than he felt himself to be. And great may have been the aiding placidity of her spirit, which, had it been otherwise tempered, would, as a rusty blade, long since have fretted through and destroyed its scabbard. Until the present, her troubles probably were limited to roguish tenants and marauding kerns; while his daily, never-ending labours, were to countermine Spanish aggression and domestic intrigue.

But, whatever were the trains of thought raised by the appearance of the old Countess, the result was the same, an intense interest in her

---

\* When I visited the Church of Saint Martin's, Stampford, where the great Lord Burghley and the elder branch of the Cecils are buried, the sexton directed my particular attention to the monument of "The Travelling Earl," which my informant stated the earl himself had brought from Italy; and the "History of Burghley House and Saint Martin's Church" describes it as "a lofty and splendid Monument of white and veined marble, nearly thirty feet high, erected to the memory of John, fifth Earl of Exeter, and his Countess. It was executed by Monnot, the Italian sculptor, under the immediate direction of the earl himself." On the monument is inscribed:—

"Petrus Stephanus Monnot  
fecit Romæ MDCCIV."

But as the earl died in 1700, and the countess in 1703, the monument, though ordered by the earl, was not erected until after the death of the countess.

It is an open altar-tomb, of white marble, the upper table supported by four female figures, representing Fortitude, Justice, Temperance, and Prudence. On this table, the head resting on a superb cushion, is the full-length, life-size effigy of the Right Honourable Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, Lord High Treasurer to his Majesty, and Knight of the Most Noble Order of the Garter, in all the trappings of peerage, office, and knight-hood. Immediately below, on a table of black marble, is spread a coarse straw mat, the unrolled end forming a pillow, on which lies extended a skeleton—thus contrasting present humility and past grandeur, the pomp of life with the nothingness of the grave—mortality unclad.

suit, and for its success. Those more immediately connected with the Government satisfied themselves that, as the Queen had provided for the widow and children of the rebel Earl, and by so doing had to allocate the provision from the revenues of the crown, surely she would befriend the present suitor, being only required to decree righteous judgment, without putting a finger into the pocket of the state. The crown lawyers were in indignant astonishment that a settlement of such long standing (21st of Henry VIII.) should be assailed and trampled under foot by an intruder, without even the pretence of a claim. The rough swordsman, who would have been ready and willing to join in ousting the rebel Earl, lance to lance, felt choking with contempt for the cowardly cur who would lay his robber hand on a defenceless old woman. Husbands saw in this transaction their own settlements reduced to waste paper; while wives and widows shuddered at the prospect of destitution, the possibility of which was visibly before them. A cloud dimmed the bright eyes of many an affectionate daughter, as, while compassionating the old Countess, her thoughts ran on, and in her terrified imagination she saw a fate that might befall her mother; and, under the same influences, the hands of sons clutched and worked on their daggers, with a burning wish to bury them in the villain's heart that had done this foul deed. When Sir Walter had concluded his statement, he handed to Sir Edward Coke, Her Majesty's Attorney-General, the Countess's settlement of jointure, dated the 17th September, 1529, executed by Earl Thomas, shortly after attaining the title and estates, on the death of his nephew, Earl James, which occurred June 18th, 1529 (see Hamilton's "Calendar of State Papers relating to Ireland," page 7. Lond. 1860), calling Mr. Attorney's attention to the endorsement on the deed, certifying that it had been registered in his then Majesty's Court of King's Bench in Dublin, the following term. Sir Edward, to whom the deed had been previously sent, and who in his chambers had made himself master of its contents, with due gravity opened, examined, pondered; and then, kneeling before the Queen, humbly submitted the settlement, with, it was presumed, his official opinion thereon, audible only to her Grace. Being motioned, he retired; and Elizabeth, drawing herself up to her utmost height, the previous hush became an almost fearful silence; not a silk rustled; every breath was suspended; every eye with anxious earnestness rested on the Queen, and every faculty of hearing was stretched to its most painful expansion. The suspense was short, the sentence sharp. The Sovereign was insulted, the Woman outraged. No one possessed in a greater perfection than Elizabeth the power of instantly and suitably speaking, whether to the loyal outburst of a gathering at the palace gates, or receiving the ambassador of Sigismund the Third, King of Poland, A. D. 1597, in the sixty-fourth year of her age, who, she understood, came to compliment her, but whose harangue was to express his master's displeasure, and threaten her with its consequences, "when," writes our old historian, Speed, "lionlike rising up, she daunted the malapert orator, not less with her stately port than with the tartness of her princely checks." Concluding her reply, she turned to her court

with—"S'death, my lords, I have been enforced this day to scour up my old Latin, that hath lain long in rusting." Her present task was easier. Graciously extending her hand to the Countess, in a few words equally reassuring, she told her she had well done to bring her wrongs to the fountain-head of justice, and that the offender should soon find distance was no safety from just retribution for his evil doings. Cecil was then directed to issue the necessary powers to restore the Countess to her rights, and to punish to the uttermost the offending churl; while to Raleigh was delegated their enforcement. The pent-up feelings of all burst forth, to the disregard of state decorum, the younger nobles tossing up their gay and jewelled caps, with the cries of "Long live the Queen's Majesty's grace!" And Elizabeth, smiling at the scene she herself had created, and receiving with renewed kindness the almost inarticulate expressions of gratitude which her "poore Bedeswoman" endeavoured to utter, retired, followed by her attendants. Released from all restraint, the whole court crushed up to the Countess, and, in their various moods, tenses, and manners, poured out the expression of their hearty joy and congratulations. Many a young gallant pressed his rising moustache, and many a lovely damsel pressed her cherry lips, on the withered, wrinkled hand of the olde Ladye Cattelyn in all the sincerity of reverential, affectionate sympathy. And when Raleigh, fearing the continuance of this excitement, respectfully placing her arm in his, intimated their departure, the gay and glittering throng fell back on each side, opening a passage, and forming, as it were, a brilliant body-guard, with the kind word and the kind wish from every individual for her, as they passed through it. At the court of Edward Plantagenet, Katherin Fitzgerald had been one star in its galaxy of youth and beauty, dividing with the other stars of the constellation homage and adoration. But on this eventful day, at the court of Elizabeth Tudor, the old Countess of Desmond was the one star of the firmament,—engrossing every thought, engaging every hope, in whose success every heart rejoiced, identifying itself with hers, and feeling her triumphs as its own.

We have thus, step by step, accompanied our noble ambassador at Paris to the conclusion of his hazy dream, possibly an after-dinner forty winks, induced by the rival seductions of Lafitte and Margaux. But we must leave him with "Nature's soft nurse, sleep, gentle sleep," and return to the cold realities of waking life.

Sir Walter Raleigh, after his return from Youghal, which we are to presume was in 1589, formed part of Queen Elizabeth's court during the remainder of her reign. In his work, published in 1614, he brings our old Countess forward as a remarkable instance of long life. He does not specify her age, but states that she was married in the reign of Edward IV., and that he knew her in 1589. Edward IV. died 9th April, 1483, so that if the Countess had only been married in 1482, at the age of eighteen, she would have been 125. And Sir Walter continues, she lived many years since; but so little does he expect to be believed, that he adds "and that this is true all the noblemen and gen-

tlemen of Munster can witnesse." Now, Sir Walter wrote to an English public; and if the Countess had appeared at the English court to claim the restoration of her jointure-lands, her person and her history would have been known, not only to all the noblemen and gentlemen, but to all the public of London, to whom, and not to those of Munster, Sir Walter would have more naturally and confidently appealed. His not doing so, in my opinion, establishes a clear "alibi" for the Countess not having been at the English court between 1589, when Sir Walter left her at Inchiquin, and her death in 1604.

We have now to call up Sir Francis Bacon, who will establish as clear an "alibi" as Sir Walter, that the Countess was not in London subsequent to 1589. Bacon sought public employment, and was never absent from court, until sacrificed by James I. to screen Buckingham; and he became a member of the House of Commons in 1593. It was, therefore, impossible for the Countess to have been in London and Bacon not to have seen her. Remember, also, that Bacon's inductive philosophy requiring the test for the credence, cost him his life. Though the circumstance is so well known, I give it from Bohn's edition of his *Essays, &c.*, London, 1854. "It struck him (Bacon), when examining the subject of antiseptics, that snow might preserve flesh from corruption, and he resolved to try the experiment. One frosty morning, in the spring of 1626, he alighted at Highgate, and proceeded to stuff a fowl, which he had bought at a neighbouring cottage, with snow, which he had gathered from the ground. At the end of the operation he felt in his limbs a sudden chill, a fever ensued, and he lingered only a week."

If this man of facts had ever had the opportunity of seeing the Countess, he would have spoken of her from his own certain knowledge and conviction; but in retailing the information given by the people about Youghal to Fynes Moryson, in the first instance, his language is—" *They say for certain;*" he himself knows nothing on the subject, nor expresses any belief in what has been told him. In the second instance we descend considerably—" *They tell a tale.*" Words can scarcely usher in anything more contemptuously. The Countess's patriarchal age was a possibility, and we have the lavation of old salt butter before a blazing pile of turf suggested. But dentiring at the period of possible second childhood is left as a nursery tale.

We have, therefore, the testimony of two persons residing at the court of Elizabeth that they were ignorant of the Countess having been there. And we now pass over to Youghal with Fynes Moryson, to learn that no one there knew anything of the Countess ever having been absent from Inchiquin.

I should feel quite content to leave the decision of this question to a careful consideration and comparison of these two authorities—my Lord Leicester in 1640, and Fynes Moryson in 1613. The latter was an old and experienced traveller, at a time when travelling was accompanied with difficulties and dangers, of which we in these days can only form an idea by reading of what he encountered in his ten years' wandering

over most part of Europe and much of Asia. And if we refer to his "Precepts for Travellers," Part iii, Book i., we find that the traveller is required to observe and note everything; and the record of his journeyings proves that he practised what he preached. As secretary to the Lord Deputy Mountjoy, he had been from 1599 to 1603 actively employed in Ireland, and was thoroughly acquainted with the Irish. Unexpectedly, by stress of weather, in 1613, he finds himself in Youghal, where he makes the most of the chance opportunity to collect information. And, from his rank and connexions, we may be sure that all were anxious to meet his inquiries, and to communicate their own several, separate stores of information. This, we are to remember, was in A. D. 1613, and that the Countess had died there in 1604, say nine years previously. Moryson's information of the old Countess was, therefore, most probably obtained from individuals personally acquainted with her, "that she had lived to the age of 140 years; that in her last years she was able to walk four or five miles to the market town (Youghal) weekly; and that not many years before she died she had all her teeth renewed." So, when Fynes in his "Itinerary" comes to treat on "long life," the Irish Countess of Desmond becomes a remarkable illustration. But if, instead of an occasional walk of four or five miles out, and as many home, he could have stated that she had walked 120 miles consecutively, would he not have done so? and raised the really wondrous into the wondrously marvellous. And is it in the nature of any informant—an Irish one, more especially—to dwell on a comparatively trifling incident, and to be silent on what would be really and truly astounding, "barring only" that it had occurred. And yet, in 1613, when Moryson was at Youghal, "taking notes" of all he could glean that was interesting, every individual of the age of twenty, or even less, would have personally known, at least by sight, the great lady at the Castle of Inchiquin, only five miles from them, and whom, in her walks to Youghal, they had seen so frequently. Consider the idolatry that has ever existed in Ireland towards ancient and noble families—the feeling for blood which pervades all classes. I remember a countrywoman speaking to my mother respecting the wife of a neighbouring farmer—"Oh, Ma'am, she was a Kirby, and people was surprised that she demeaned herself to marry a Murphy." And in the Desmond family, Thomas, who became the sixth earl, A. D. 1399, marrying the beautiful Katherin M'Cormack, daughter of one of his tenants, was expelled from his estates and earldom by his family and vassals, for forming an alliance so dishonouring to his blood, and died an exile in France, Sir William Betham considers about A. D. 1421-2,—the Harleian, 1430. But our Countess was a Geraldine by birth, and a Desmond by marriage; combining in fullest perfection old blood and old nobility. Her husband, on attaining the earldom in 1529, when he was seventy-six years of age, fixed his residence at the Castle of Inchiquin, where he died 1534; and the castle, being part of his widow's jointure, she continued its occupant until her death, in 1604, a residence of seventy-five years, she being sixty-five when she came there as Countess. "The oldest inhabitant" of Youghal and its neigh-



bouring country, therefore, could only have known her from his earliest recollection, as being then a very ancient, old lady; and I can imagine the minds of old people in her neighbourhood to have become awed and bewildered, while feeling in themselves the gradual, creeping infirmities of declining life, to see years on years, years on years, passing, gone; and the great lady at the castle none the older, but as hale, as hearty, and as strong as when they were but children; still to be seen walking from the castle to the town for her pleasure, "shè that could ride, if she but pleased, the best horse in the kingdom, with her beautiful pillion, all velvet and gold!" And in her later period, when, amidst the wreck, ruin, and desolation of this princely, patriarchal family, she, the venerable, solitary widow of a long past, an almost forgotten generation, she alone had remained unscathed, untouched—a fragmentary remnant of its past magnificent grandeur and power. Could all this be daily before the eyes, and in the thoughts, of the imaginative Irish, and not raise in their minds a mysterious and undefined idea that hers was no common life, but one guarded and preserved by an unseen Power, surely for some high and special design. The great Earl had perished miserably in his ill-advised rebellion. His only son, the last of the titled race, had since died, a prisoner in the Tower of London. The Earl's boundless estates in the counties of Kerry, Limerick, Tipperary, Cork, and Waterford, had been parcelled out in endless divisions, and were occupied by strangers. Yet the old Countess Cattelyn remained among them, unharmed; and for twenty years after its downfall, in her the Geraldine still seemed to have one to represent it. And when, at long, long length, her wondrous course was closed, and she, too, with her husband, and six preceding earls, found her last earthly home in the Franciscan Friary at Youghal, her memory must have gathered round it an awful and affectionate reverence, from the recollection of her ancient lineage and high rank, her fabulous old age, and that with her the great house of Desmond was now indeed extinct!—that the proud halls of Askeaton were, as the regal halls of Tara, levelled in the dust,—the glories of the Geraldines, like those of Brian, of Clontarf, passed away to the bards and minstrels of other days; and all that now remained to the sorrowing survivors was the *Caoine*\* that had wailed over the old Countess Cattelyn; while a Boyle lorded in the castle of Inchiquin, and a Preston flaunted in the ermine and coronet of Desmond!

When, therefore, Fyies Morryson, nine years only after her death, was making his inquiries of all that was interesting and noteworthy, and when his informants came to the history of their old Countess, I again ask is it within the possibility of human nature, that, if she had been forcibly and illegally dispossessed of her castle and jointure, had been driven to wend her way over sea to Bristol, and from Bristol to toil

---

\* The pronunciation of *Caoine* is nearly *Queen-a*. That of the *c* is very like the French *que*.—J. WINDELE.

‡ *Caoine*, pronounced *Kwee-nā*, softening or dropping the sound of *w* as much as you can; or *Ko'een-na*, shortening the *o*, so as to make the sound *Ko'een* one syllable.—O. C.

on foot to London, to seek the redress of her cruel and bitter grievances, and in her 140th year had successfully surmounted those difficulties and dangers, made good her way to Queen Elizabeth, got back her own, and with the Sovereign's writ of restitution in her aged hands, had returned triumphant to dispossess in her turn the robber occupant of Inchiquin Castle; and that within its walls, and as its mistress, she had ended her days in peace; yet that on all these wonders, in all of which every man, woman, and child, would have taken an Irish, burning frenzied rejoicing and exulting interest, every talking and narrating individual was silent, and all they would communicate to the curious and inquiring English stranger respecting their Countess was, that she lived to be about 140 years of age, had young teeth in her old days, and once a week took a walk of some eight or ten miles. If any persons can bring themselves to believe that this could have occurred at Youghal in A. D. 1613,—if the Countess, by her wrongs, had been driven to England, I have only to say that I am not one of their number, and I suspect also that I am one of very many.

I may now briefly refer to the grounds on which I arrive at the conclusion that the Countess was not disturbed in the possession of her jointure, and did not appear at the court of Elizabeth seeking redress.

The story rests solely on the gossip of the Earl of Leycester, who distinctly states the occurrence to have taken place in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; his table-talk was written at Paris, A. D. 1640, being thirty-six years after the Countess's death. To the absurd improbabilities of the tale attention has been directed.

The Countess's legal rights to her jointure were acknowledged and admitted by Queen Elizabeth's Government, who accepted the return made in 1589 of Earl Garrett's forfeited estates, so charged, and Sir Walter Raleigh's return at the same time that Inchiquin continued in her occupation as her jointure. We have further Sir Walter Raleigh's lease of 1588 to Mr. Cleaver, and to Mr. Reve, 1589, proving the Countess had an acknowledged first charge on the lands, by the rent doubling itself, and a light-horseman to be maintained by the tenants on her death. And when Sir Walter appealed to all the noblemen and gentry of Munster, as knowing the Countess, of course they equally knew her established position and legal rights as Dowager Countess of Thomas, Earl of Desmond.

In the face of this known and acknowledged legal right of jointure for her life, who could attempt to disturb her possession of it?

This I consider direct positive evidence.

We have then the negative.

I have shown that Sir Walter Raleigh and Sir Francis Bacon were both constant residents in London from 1589, when we know that the Countess was residing undisturbed at Inchequin; so that she could not have been in London without their being acquainted with it. And yet both these parties, as appears in their writings referring to her, know nothing of it.

Fynes Moryson is at Youghal in 1613, nine years only after her death; but no one there knew anything of her ever having been evicted from her castle and lands, or of her having gone to England to recover them.

Any person conversant with business in public offices is aware that all transactions go through certain forms of writing, which become official records; and if the Countess Katherin had been driven to seek redress at the English court, there must have been documentary records of her application and its results. Yet in the search we have made at the State Paper Office in London, we cannot find a single paper. But of the Countess Ellynor, an abundance turned up, some of which, as interesting historic matter, will follow, though no ways connected with my inquiry, unless as adding their negative evidence that the old Countess could not have been a suppliant to Elizabeth; for had she, similar proof would have been forthcoming.

I submit I have shown that the Earl of Leycester's story respecting the old Countess of Desmond is a tissue of absurd improbabilities in itself, and that it is disproved by the most conclusive evidence, positive and negative.

We now come to the consideration of the paintings, assuming or assumed to be portraits of the old Countess of Desmond.

Rembrandt was born 1606, Gerard Dow 1613; consequently, any portraits painted by these great artists are at once put out of court.

At Muckcross Abbey, Killarney, the seat of the Right Hon. Henry Arthur Herbert, M. P. for the county of Kerry, there is a portrait which asserts itself, by an inscription under it, to have been painted from the living original; and of which, as a portrait of the old Countess, the "Quarterly" pronounces, "the *vraisemblance* is at Muckcross" (p. 353). The difficulty of the painter's own date the "Quarterly" easily disposes of, thus: "the date 1614 *must* be an error for 1604" (p. 343). The inscription is in these words, in modern English print letters (as distinguished from old black letter):—"Catherine, Countesse of Desmonde, as she appeared at y<sup>e</sup> Court of our Soureigne Lord King James, in thys preasant A. D. 1614, and in y<sup>e</sup> 140<sup>th</sup> yeare of her age. Thither she came from Bristol to seek relief, y<sup>e</sup> house of Desmond having been ruined by attainer. She was married in y<sup>e</sup> reigne of King Edward IV., and, in y<sup>e</sup> course of her longe pilgrimage, renewed her teeth twice. Her principal residence is at Inchiquin, in Munster, whither she undauntedly proposeth (her purpose accomplished) incontinentlie to return. Laus Deo."

It does not appear so clear to me as to the "Quarterly" that a picture dated by the painter 1614 *must* have been painted by him in 1604.

Let us suppose Mrs. Herbert, of Muckcross, to have been at the Drawing-room and St. Patrick's Ball, at Dublin Castle, this present A. D. 1860; and, while in Dublin, having sat for her portrait, that Mr. Herbert, wishing to have Mrs. Herbert's participation of the Earl of Carlisle's viceregal festivities recorded on its canvas, thus—"Mrs. Herbert, as she appeared at the Court of his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant of

Ireland, this *present* A. D. 1860"—can any one bring himself to believe that the painter could inscribe 1870? A portrait painter, who has to remark and to record every line and variation in his sitter, cannot be an absent man. A man in a state of intoxication could not paint letters of any size, and I suppose those on the Muckcross painting are of small dimensions. We may at any time make a mistake as to the day of the month, but, after the first week in January, we never make a mistake in the date of the year; and then it is the past, instead of the present, we use, 1859 for 1860. Surely, it would not be ten years hence, 1870.

Allowing common sense to give place to good nature, let us try to suppose that our artist did paint A. D. 1870, in the absence of mind, or in the bewilderment of wine. Yet, is it not passing strange that in this haze he could copy the long inscription Mr. Herbert had given him with only one mistake, and that the only fact, the every-day matter of fact, with which he was perfectly well acquainted, the date of the *present* year? Well, let that pass. But paint will not dry for some days (I know it would not in 1824, and I infer that it does not in 1860). Then, during those days, before the picture could be sent home, did the painter continue in this haze, and the mistake of the date remain unnoticed? Were there no apprentices, or assistants, who watched and scrutinized "Master's doings," be he clear or hazy—no curiosity to read what was said on the canvas about this lady from the country, a circumstance so very unusual? no visitors, no new sitters, all anxious to see, and the painter more anxious to show *his* portrait of the great and beautiful lady from the Kingdom of Kerry, for whom gentle and simple had but the same appellation, "The Kerry Diamond"? And were all eyes and intellects as hazy as the painter's had been, and continued to be? Assume all this, and (as Mr. Roebuck remarked to one who assumed that the Admiralty had done all that they ought to have done), you assume a great deal! Be it so. And now the picture is sent to Mr. Herbert. But will he not read the inscription, and will he overlook 1870 for 1860? You say at once that he certainly will read, and will not overlook the blunder. So, the portrait is returned for correction, and comes back to Mr. Herbert with "this *Present* A. D." 1860.

Now, if the Muckcross portrait had been painted from the living Kathrin, Countess of Desmond, it must have been for some one (like my supposed portrait of Mrs. Herbert) interested in having it taken, who had furnished the inscription, and who, consequently, would have detected the erroneous date of "*thys preasant A. D.*," and have had it altered to the true time.

Thus we see that, in the anxiety of the composer of this inscription to silence doubt, by inserting "*thys preasant A. D. 1614*," how he has *thereby* defeated himself.

But his ignorance has led him into a blunder, which alone would prove his pretentious statement to be a comparatively modern fabrication—the Countess's Christian name on the canvas commences with C, instead of K. I have no doubt that C was the usual mode when the

inscription was placed on this picture; but, in 1604 or 1614, *Katherin* was the only mode of spelling that Christian nomenclature. Let us try back a little for instances, facts being stubborn things.

Henry the Eighth chose to compliment some of his Queens by joining their initials with his own on some of his coinages, for circulation in Ireland, but which were coined in London; and we have H. A. (Henry and Anne), H. I. (Henry and Jane), H. K. (Henry and Katherine).\*

In the award made at Cork, 22nd January, 1555, by James, Erle of Desmond, the aggrieved and complaining party was *Katerin Roche*. (See Roche MS., printed in the 2nd vol. of "*Olla Podrida*," p. 428.)

In 1562, Augustine Berhner dedicates to *Katherine*, Dutchess of Suffolk, Latimer's Sermons, preached, 1552, at her Grace's request.

In 1564, at the Herald's visitation for the county of Devon, Peter Sainthill, of Bradninch, registers his first wife as *Kath. Browne*.

Grafton's "*Chronicle*," printed 1572, gives *Katherine* as Queen to Henry the Fifth, and three of Henry the Eighth's Queens were *Katherine*s.

And then we have the very remarkable and all-important deed of the old Countess herself, dated August 5th, 1575, which commences, "whereas I, Lady *Kathrin*, late wief to Thomas, late Earle of Desmond," &c. As the Countess was born, we suppose, not later than 1464, and took the name *Kathrin* in baptism, we have her proof that *K* commenced *Kathrin* when she commenced Christianity. The feast of Saint *Katherine*, Virgin and Martyr, is celebrated on the 25th November.

To bring this inquiry down to the period of the assumed inscription, I wrote to a friend in London, who is just reposing from the labours of bringing out a new edition of Shakspeare's Plays, to know how the name in question was spelt in the first folio, 1623. He replies, "In the folio it is always spelt with a *K*; sometimes there it occurs as *Katherine*, and sometimes as *Katherine*."

We thus have a stream of authorities as evidence to show that, from about 1464 to 1623, the name always occurs commencing with *K*. And we may go much further back; for, on referring to the Calendar of Saints in Sir Harris Nicholas's "*Chronology of History*," we find, at p. 131, *Catherine*, *vide Katherine*. At p. 147, we have six *Katherine*s. Of these, the first, *Katherine*, Virgin and Martyr, is believed to have suffered martyrdom in the fourth century; and the last, *Katherine* of Sienna, died towards the close of the fourteenth.

In France, at a later period, *K* was used in Latin inscriptions where *C* now appears. I have coins of Charles the Seventh, who died 1461, and Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, 1477, whose names are en-

\* I am indebted to my kind friend, Dr. A. Smith, for the following note, which bears strongly on this point—*K* used instead of *C* in a proper name:—

"Dr. William Bulleyn, who died on the 7th of January, 1576, in his book, '*The Government of Health*,' mentions Dr. William Kunningham. See '*Biographia Britannica*, vol. II., p. 1022. Folio, London: 1748.'"

graved *Karolus*. I have also a medal of Henry the Third of France; reverse, the bust of his mother, who died 1589 (the same year as her son), inscription, "*Kath. Hen. II. Ux. Hen. III. Fran. et Pol. Reg. Mat. Augu.*" These instances evidence that K then occupied the position that C has done in more modern times. I am, however, concerned with the English orthography of 1614, and I contend that, in the painter's Catherine we have a name never heard of in England, years after 1614, where the picture professes to have been painted. And can we believe that the person for whom the portrait was painted, and who may have seen the Countess write her name, or, at all events, must have known how she wrote it, could have acquiesced in the mistake, when C was an unheard-of departure from established spelling? In these our days we could only match it by inscribing *Sharlotte* for *Charlotte*.

On all these grounds, I come to the conclusion that the Muckcross portrait is not that of the old Countess of Desmond, but that the inscription is a comparatively modern fabrication, to enhance in value what we understand really is a painting of high artistic merit.

With the exception of the Muckcross portrait, I apprehend that the credibility of all the other portraits, assumed to be those of the old Countess of Desmond, rest only on a supposed tradition, which cannot refer to any authority, good, bad, or indifferent. In one instance this has been recently exemplified, I may truly say, to the great regret of every person who was acquainted with it—the portrait which has been in the possession of the family of the Knight of Kerry for generations, and considered to be that of the old Countess of Desmond, but which the present Knight has clearly, provokingly, and I had almost said wickedly, ascertained to have been painted by Gerard Dow. In the family of an ancient and exalted branch of the Geraldines her portrait would have been in its natural position; and this picture fully realized all that expectation could have imagined to have distinguished the living original—the quiet dignity of high birth and rank, with a graceful, but powerfully developed frame, capable in its nature of vigorously sustaining health and intellect, through such a marvellously protracted period of years, to the attainment of that settled, earnest, yet observant placidity, whose equanimity, it would seem, joy could rarely elate, or sorrow scarcely depress—the intensity of old age, but with the absence of decline, mental or physical.

This picture was admirably engraved by Grogan, of Cork, in 1806, for Pelham's intended work on Kerry; and I consider myself very fortunate in having a proof before the letters, in splendid condition.\*

The unwilling, regretful certainty that this characteristic picture, as the portrait of the old Countess, is proved a myth, has, I acknowledge, first raised in my mind the question, "Does her portrait exist?" and the

---

\* The copperplate, engraved by Grogan, is now the property of Mr. A. Evans, printseller, No. 403, Strand, London.

result of my consideration is, that there is not the slightest probability that her likeness ever was taken.

Judging from what I have seen, and from my inquiries, addressed to the present representatives of old and estated families, I am strongly impressed with the conviction that family portraiture in Ireland was diffused by the Cromwellians. Settling down on the lands which their swords had transferred to them, they seem to have placed a picture of their chief in their castles and mansions as the penates, or protecting power, of their acquired possessions. At the mansion of a Cromwellian family, in the county of Tipperary, I saw the great Lord Protector, the only portrait in the house; another came under my ken, from a county of Cork family; and I have a third, a very fine painting, the features much softened down, but the characteristic likeness preserved; it descended to the gentleman who sold it to me from Colonel Barrachia Wallis, who wrested the castle and lands of Carrigrohane, county of Cork, from the Philistine Barrett, when the image of Dagon gave place to that of Oliver, whose head subsequently became a favourite seal. I have two letters, addressed to William Crosbie, of Ardfert, Kerry, afterwards created Earl of Glandore—one, from its tenour, rather earlier than 1758, has Oliver's profile, copied from his shilling, inscribed "The Glorious Protector;" the other, dated "Decem<sup>r</sup> 4, 1760," is also a profile, evidently from the marble bust at the residence of the Cromwell family at Cheshunt, Hertfordshire.

At the expulsion of James II., the victors set up their idol, King William, in rivalry of the Protector; and family portraits seem from this period, though very slowly, to make their appearance. In private families I have seen few authenticated before the close of George II.'s reign; nor did the taste seem to have had much existence among the nobility. At Portumna Castle there was a portrait of the great Marquis of Clanricarde, of the time of Charles I., and the only other was that of the late earl. Both must have perished when the castle was burnt. At Rostellan Castle the oldest portrait, and, in my estimation, the only family painting of merit, was that of the celebrated Morrough O'Bryen, sixth Baron of Inchiquin, created earl by Charles II. So, at length, I come to the conclusion, that at the period of our old Countess, portrait painting was an art not practised in Ireland.

Nor can this conclusion be a matter of any surprise, when we quietly recollect what was the social, or rather utterly unsocial, state of the kingdom without the small territory called "The Pale," of which Dublin was the capital.

The island was occupied, with but rare exceptions, by native Irish chieftains, and so-called English nobles, "more Irish than the Irish," who, if not banded for the time in league against the Lord Deputy, always found pleasant little differences between themselves to prevent their swords becoming rusty for want of employment, and were more intent on destroying than preserving the image of heaven's master-piece, even in its fairest type,—woman! Seriously ask yourselves, when you recall those times, and the persons who flourished, what arts found favour

in their eyes beyond those that enabled them to appropriate their neighbour's chattles and possessions to their own use and behoof? or, among the smaller fry, than would assist their endeavour to keep the little they might have left from these "Dragons of Wantley," by whom the land was infested? Had a bard, a mason, or a smith sought shelter or employment at their castle gates, they would have been understood, and, as pride or necessity induced, they may have been entertained or employed; but had the painter made his appearance, and tendered the appliances of his art at Inchiquin, so utterly incomprehensible would his application have sounded in the ears of the grim, savage, old earl, our Countess's husband, whose historian gravely records as a subject of gratulation to "The Bald Knight," that two lords of Muskerry, one of whom was his first wife's father, fell beneath his sword! that, in the conviction of the stranger being either a spy or a wizard, his fate would have been to dangle in a halter over the outer wall of the castle,—a warning for "the likes on him" to keep at a safer distance, if they valued their necks.\*

I think this is a fair and rational estimate of the state of Irish-chieftain society at this period; and we have now to inquire is there anything that has come to our knowledge of the old Countess that can induce the slightest idea that she ever sat for her portrait?

All the reliable information that we have of her, that I am aware of, is that of Sir Walter Raleigh, who writes that he personally knew her in 1589; and we are to presume that on her authority he states that she was married in the reign of King Edward IV.; but he does not specify where she was married. Sir George Carew fixes her death to have occurred in 1604; nine years after this (1613), Fynes Moryson, at Youghal, is informed that she lived to about the age of 140. Where she resided from her marriage (probably about 1482) to her husband's becoming earl, in 1529, we have no information. On attaining the title he was 76, and took

\* "From Calendar of State Papers of Ireland, 1509 to 1573." London, 1860:—

1566, March 1. Dublin. Lord Deputy Sidney to the Earl of Leicester.—"The English Pale spoiled daily, and in utter poverty, the soldiers so beggarlike and insolent, and allied with the Irish, that nothing can correct them. One may ride 30 miles, and not see one house left standing, where Sydney has known it as well inhabited as in many counties in England. Thomond worse still."

April 20, 1567, p. 330.—"Lord Deputy to the Queen. Description of Munster during Sydney's eleven weeks and two days' journey. Good conformitie of the towns, and some parts of the country. Great disorders and wasted towns in other parts. Ikerwin, called O'Meagher's Country, all waste and uninhabited. Verie greate possessions in that county of Cork, who ought to be free subjects, are so injured and exacted upon by the late Earl of Desmond, as as in effect they are, or were, become his thralls or slaves. Desmond's flagrant tyrannies, the burning of villages and ruin of churches in his land. Yea, the view of the bones and skulls of your ded subjects, who partelie by murder, partelie by famine, have died in the feldes is such that hardelie anny Christian, with drie eyes, coulde beholde."

"Castletown, Sept. 14, 1568, p. 390. Lord Roche to the Lords Justices, complains that the Earl of Clancarty and others, with 6 or 7 banners displayed, has taken 1500 kine, burned 7000 sheep, all his corn, and a great number of men, women and children, desires a commission to hurt the said Earl."



up his residence at Youghal, near which town the Countess resided until her death, in 1604. Let us now consider what was the probability that either she, or any other person, would think of having her portrait taken; or, if such a thought had occurred to any one, how it could have been realised at Youghal, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Youghal was one of the chief head-quarters of the Desmonds, where pillage and plunder, rather than any of the peaceful arts and their refinements, were studied and practised. As to painting portraits, I question, at that time, if they even painted their doors; as to windows, as we understand the term glazed apertures, they were then, I suspect, of very rare occurrence, and I much doubt whether there may have been many panes of glass in the castle of Inchiquin. Yet, supposing that Youghal previous to 1604 was in a more advanced state of civilization than I have estimated, it was neither a place of trade nor of thoroughfare; and if a stranger was seen there, he was most probably, like Fynes Moryson, driven in from sea by stress of weather, or seeking safety for his life from some murderous, predatory inroad of an O'Keefe or an O'Kelly. A portrait painter finding his way professionally to Youghal, during the lifetime of our Countess, is a flight of fancy beyond my poor ideas. I question much whether such a craft existed at that time in the length and breadth of the green island.

But the "*Quarterly*" may assume, where it assumes so much, that the extraordinary longevity of the noble lady must have occasioned great interest at the court of Elizabeth; that a painter had been sent over to Inchiquin Castle to take her portrait for the Queen; that he brought back the painting, which is still at Windsor Castle, but which is not, I have ascertained, catalogued as that of the old Countess of Desmond;\* and that from this assumed original those portraits in other collections most probably have been copied, with possible variations.

Plausible as this theory undoubtedly would be, and accounting satisfactorily for the origin of the portraits called the old Countess's, there is a trifling difficulty attending it, analogous to the date of 1614 on the Muckross picture, which is, that when the English public first became acquainted with the history of the old Countess, she had been dead for some years. The date painted on canvas, we have seen, is easily disposed of; but the date printed in a book is a more stubborn fact. Now, the date of the original edition of Sir Walter Raleigh's work is 1614, and of Fynes Moryson's, 1617 (the *Quarterly* says that Fynes Moryson

---

\* I have been favoured by a gentleman at Windsor Castle, in answer to my inquiries respecting the picture there, rumoured to be a portrait of the old Countess of Desmond, with these particulars:—"It is said to be by Rembrandt, and is a very fine portrait; there is lace on the head-dress, and a fur tippet, a collar round the neck, and coming down in front, and no lacing. But it cannot be the portrait of the Countess of Desmond; and with this agrees the opinion of Nagler (Band 12, s. 419), who calls it Rembrandt's mother, or the portrait of an old lady."

I find this entry in the catalogue of the pictures of Charles I.:—"Done by Rembrandt. An old woman, with a great scarf on her head, with a peaked, falling band (2 f. & 1 f. 6)." And with this our picture agrees exactly.—B. B. W.

died in 1614, but "the King's Letters Patents to F. M. to print his Itinerary is dated 29th Aprill, in the 15th year of his Maiestie's raigne in England," which was 1617). These writers only made the Countess known in England.

Lord Bacon, whose works referring to the Countess were published in 1623 and 1627, merely copies from Moryson. In 1640 my Lord Leycester at Paris scribbled his Table-talk. But when Charles II. was restored, and people had time to be idle, and portraits became fashionable, then I suspect that paintings were first baptized with the nomenclature of the old Countess of Desmond; and as such by tradition, and the war-rantry of picture-dealers, have come down to us as unquestionable originals.

#### APPENDIX.

*From the Calendar of State Papers relating to Ireland, 1509 to 1573, page 7.*

James, 11th Earl of Desmond, died June 18, 1529.

*From H. C. Hamilton's Calendar, page 106. 1550, Feb., after 2.*

Lord Chancellor Alen to his brother Thomas to declare to the Government of England.

"The Countess of Ormond's practice to marry with the heir of Desmond. Alen's remonstrance. Her honour first to have husband so noble a man as she had, and after his death to have so noble a gentleman as this was, by whom she should enjoy an honest portion of living, for little more than a year's pain." "So in thende she promised me upon hir honor that she would lyve sole for oon yere."

Page 193.

Joan Countess of Desmond (and Countess Dowager of Ormond and Ossory, Ob. 1564) to Cecil in favour of the bearer, Andrew Skiddy, and his purpose of renewing his suit for the Grey Friars of Cork. License for corn.

#### BRITISH MUSEUM.

*Cotton MSS.—Titus B. XIII., p. 195.*

This is a true copie of the feofm<sup>t</sup> made by Gerald, Earle of Desmond, (testified under the Lo: Deputy and Councell's hands), w<sup>ch</sup> appeareth to be made, seven weaks after the combination, 1574.

This deed, dated the 10th September, 1574, in the sixteenth year of our Queen Elizabeth, refers to, and confirms, a previous deed, dated 15th March, in the thirteenth yeare (1571) of ye prosperous raigne of our Sovereigne Ladie Queene Elizabeth, the Queene's Ma<sup>tie</sup> that nowe is, enfeofes James, Baron of Dunboyne, and Redmond Everett, with all his estates under certain trusts and entails.

After the Earl's rebellion "all deeds dated subsequent to one that proved his intent to rebel were pronounced void" (Exchequer MS.

Records, Dublin, quoted by *Quarterly*, page 352). Under which enactment, no doubt, these deeds and the assignment of the old Countess, 5th August, 1575, became waste paper.

*Cotton MSS.*—Titus B XIII., p. 126, Plut. xxvi., page 248.

The combination of Garret, late Earle of Desmond, attainted of high treason, in A°. 1578.

Where the Right Honorable Garret, Earle of Desmond, hath assembled us, his kinsmen, followers, friends, and servants, about him, after his coming out of Dublin, and made us privie to such articles as by the Lo: Deputy and Councell was delivered unto him the viii<sup>th</sup> of July, 1578, to be performed, as also his answers to sayd. Weh answeres we find so reasonable as we w<sup>th</sup> one accord doe councell and advise the sayd Earle not to consent nor yield to any more then in his answer is already graunted. And further, the sayd Earle declared unto us that if he doe not yield presently to the pformance of the same articles, and put in his pledges for observation thereof, that then the Lo: Deputy will lend his force and make war against him, We, the psons under written, doe advise and councell the sayd Earle to defende himself from the violence of the sayd Lo: Deputy that doth ask so unreasonable a demande, as in the sayd Articles is contayned. And for to defende and sticke to this our advise and councell. Wee renounce God, if we doe spare life, body, lands and goods, but will be ayding, helpinge, and assistinge the sayd Earle to mayntain, and defende this o<sup>r</sup> advise against the sayd Lo: Deputy, or any other that will covet the sayd Earle's inheritance. In witness whereof that this is our councell to the sayd Earle we have hereunto put our hands the xvij<sup>th</sup> of July, 1578.

GARRET DESMOND.	THEOBALD BURKE,	ULICKE M <sup>c</sup> THOMAS, of
THOMAS LIXNAWE.	DONEL O'BRIEN,	Ballancarrighe.
JOHN OF DESMOND.	RICHARD BURKE.	ULICKE BURKE.
JOHN FITZJEAMES.	JOHN BROWNE.	JOHN FITZWILLIAM, of
RORYE MCSHEAGHE.	DANIEL M <sup>c</sup> CANNA, of	Rarew Dirty.
MOROUGH O'BRIEN.	Drombrane.	TIGHE O'HEYNE, of
MORIERTAGH M <sup>c</sup> BRIEN,	JAMES RUSSELL.	Cairreyley.
of Longforthe.	RICHARD FITZEDMUND	
JA., K E ff D R B.	GERALD.	

*Copia vera ex<sup>t</sup>.* MATHEW DILLON.

FROM HER MAJESTY'S STATE PAPER OFFICE, LONDON.

1580, Apr. 1.—*Camp at Carrigafoyle.*—Lord Chief Justice Pelham to the Queen.

Waste and execution in Desmond's country. Common rebels executed for their readiness to shake off the Queen's Government. Carrigafoile taken by assault after two days battery. Sixteen Spaniards, under Captain Julian kept it by assignment of the Countess of Desmond.

Poor people meeting Desmond cursed him bitterly for this war. His promises to them. Receipt of William Burke's patent of creation, and his own as Justice Requests to be discharged. All Limerick and Kerry in rebellion. Devotion of Ormond, Councillors, Captains, Gentlemen, and Soldiers.

1580.—*Apr. 5. Askeaton.—Lord Justice Pelham to Sir F. Walsingham.*

The whole of the shires of Limerick and Kerry now at her Majesty's devotion. They might be made to bear the whole charge of the garrison in Ireland. Pleasantness and commodity of the Shannon. The people of Munster docile and reformable. The practise for saving Desmond scorned by the Countess, who sent Dunboyne's letter to Sanders.

IRISH CORRESPONDENCE, STATE PAPER OFFICE.

*No. 81. (Indorsed) 1583, June 18.—To hir Ma<sup>ty</sup>, from the Erle of Ormond, (directed) to the Queen's most excellent Ma<sup>ty</sup>.*

My duetye most humblye remembered to your most exsellent Ma<sup>ty</sup>, sines the dispatch of my servant Tegg to your Highness ther wear 22 traytors put to the sword and taken, of those feaw that folloed Desmond. The Senischall of Imokillye (being the man of most account amongst the rebells) cam to me the eleventh of this month acknowleginge his great and grevose offences, most humblye craving your highnes marceye, whom I receaved for cawses tending the sarvice of your Ma<sup>ty</sup>.

The Brownes (being th'erles trostiest folloers in all these bad actions) have this day submitted them to your Highness. The Countes of Desmond being for some cawses protected, to manifest her humble duetye the more, forsoke the benefitt thereof, and put her self holye to your Ma<sup>ty</sup>'s marceye. To conclude, for avoyding your highnes farther trouble, God hath geven your sarvice that success as your good subiectes may saflye travell in anye part of this province without danger.

Now craving pardon for these my rude lines I committ your Ma<sup>ty</sup> to the blessed guying of God, who make your life long and your raygne most hapye From your highnes toune of Cashel the 18th of June, 1583.

Yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup>'s most humble and obedient subiect and sarvant during lyfe.

THOMAS ORMÖD & ÖSS.

IRISH CORRESPONDENCE, STATE PAPER OFFICE.

*No. 81. (Indorsed) 1583, June 18.—Erle of Ormond.—(Directed) to the right honorable my veray good ll [lords] of her Ma<sup>ty</sup>'s most honnorable privy Counsell in hast hast.*

May it please yo<sup>r</sup> most honnorable good ll to be advertised that since the dispatch of my servant Teig Mac Carty there were xxi of the fewe traitors that remained abroad put to the sword and taken. The Senischall of Imokilly (being the chefe man of servic among them) came to me the

xi<sup>th</sup> of this month, and submitted him self most humbly to her Mat<sup>ty</sup> mercye, craving her highnes pardon. This day the Brownes, who were of special trust with Th<sup>e</sup> erle in all rebellions, came hether unto me to submitt themselves to her Ma<sup>ty</sup> mercy, so as there remaineth none abroad but th<sup>e</sup> erle with a veray fewe rascall whom I can scant heare of, yea doth he continue his former suite to have conference with me, as yo<sup>r</sup> l. may perceive by the copie of his letter, which I send herein. God of his goodness hath so prospered her Ma<sup>ty</sup> service heare, as a veray fewe men may travell over all this province without any great danger.

The Countess of Desmond being protected for sum considerations, utterly forsoke the benefitt thereof, and hath put her self simply to her Ma<sup>ty</sup> mercye. This day I march towards Kierye, and woll advertise to yo<sup>r</sup> ll of all that shall passe till my retorne. And so committing yo<sup>r</sup> good ll to the blessed guiding of God, I humbly take leave From Casshill the xviii<sup>th</sup> of June, 1583.

Your good ll humblye to command.

THOMAS ORMÖD & O<sup>ss</sup>.

IRISH CORRESPONDENCE, STATE PAPER OFFICE.

No. 81. (*Indorsed*) 1583, June 18.—*From the E. of Ormond, (directed) to the Right Honorable my veray loving frend S<sup>r</sup> Frances Walsingham, principall Secretary to the Queenes moost excellent Maiestie.*

S<sup>r</sup>,—Since the dispache of my man Tieg Mac carty there were 21 of those fewe traitors that followed th<sup>e</sup> erle of Desmond put to the sword and taken. The Seniscial, being his chefe execucioner, came into me, most humbly craving her Ma<sup>ty</sup> mercye. The Brownes also, whom he specially trusted, have forsaken him and have made their most humble submission, so as in all this province there is not a traitor in rebellion, but those fewe that followe him self, lurking from place to place. The contry, God be praised, is growen to such generall quiet as a veray few men travell quietly betwne Cork and Lymbro . . . and in all other places of this province, without any great danger. The Countess of Desmond this day forsoke the benefict of her protection, and put her self wholly to her Ma<sup>ty</sup> mercye. I do not finde that Lacye can work the earle to that which he undertoke for him before the ll there, yea th<sup>e</sup> erle continueth his suit still to have conference with me. This day I marche towards the Dangan in Kiery, and as I shall procede I will advertise to you with all spede. This is the thirde post I sent to you, and as yea have herd nothing from you. So for this tyme I committ you to the blessed guiding of God. From Casshill the xviii of June, 1583.

Yo<sup>r</sup> veray assured frend,

THOMAS ORMÖD & O<sup>ss</sup>.

S<sup>r</sup>,—thogh the sarvice have this happye success, yea I pray you hast away victuals notwithstandinge, with monye and municion, that the sarvice may be the better and speedlier ended.

I pray you deliver the inclosed letter to her Maiestye.

## HARLEIAN MSS, No. 1425. BRITISH MUSEUM.

The Earle of Desmond was slaine upon the 11th November, 1583, by Donnell Mac Donnell Ymoriectagh, who w<sup>th</sup> 15 Kearnes of his owne, and 6 of the Wardens of Castle Mange, found him in a poor cabbin in Glaneinelie, nere to the River Mange in Kerrie.

Sir Richard Cox, in his "History of Ireland," (page 367 *dorso*, *recte* p. 374), writes that the person who led the party, his sister's property having been plundered by the Earl of Desmond's followers, was named Owen O'Moriarta, als Drogbearla [i. e. of the *bad English*]; but that the person who killed the Earl was Kolly, who was bred by the English, altho a native Irishman; that the place was the wood of Glawniginky, four miles from Traley.

## IRISH CORRESPONDENCE, STATE PAPER OFFICE.

No. 87. (*Indorsed*) 1584, October 24.—*From the L. Deputye, (directed) to the Queenes moast excellent Ma<sup>tie</sup>.*

May it please yo<sup>r</sup> moast excellent Ma<sup>tie</sup> becawse I yor L. Deputie have written at lardge to the moast ho: the ff and others of yo<sup>r</sup> ma<sup>ty</sup> privie counsell of the successe of your h: service in Ulster, of late, and that we the rest of yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> counsell here were made acquaynted with the same, some of us having ben ey witnesses and partakers in moast of those actions. We thinck it inconvenient to trouble yo<sup>r</sup> h: with anie new rehersall thereof, knowing their Lfs will impart yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> w<sup>th</sup> the same, wherein yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> shall fynde somethinge don and motioned to be further don, w<sup>ch</sup> being taken holde of and mayneteyned, seeme lyklye in all reasonable coniecture, to bring proffit to yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> and securitie to this State, and make yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> actions shyne above all yo<sup>r</sup> predicessors for the relief it may gieve to the miseries of this lande; hoping therein of the better successe through the blessing that hath, and we pray God ever may attend yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> and all yo<sup>r</sup> moast gracious proceedings.

It pleased yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> to require myne yo<sup>r</sup> Deputies opinion by the advice of us, of this counsell concerning the Baron of Lixnawe and his son Patricke, the Seneschall of Imoghellie, and Patricke Condon, the protecties of Munster. Having accordingly considered of the matter, we conceive that to continue them thus in protection, is to breede loosemen, while they are holden in jelozie of their safties, and a mean to make them the readier for a new sturr if anie had one shoulde start owte. And to prosecute them wilbe not onlie a farr greater chardge unto yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> then the pursute will recompence, but also a reviving of the miserie of that Province, now beginning to recover some breath, and inclyning to a generall lyking of dutie and obedience, whereof there as ells where is growne nowe a shewe of an universall tranquillitie. These men being called before me the Deputie at Limerick, and v more of us that were present, they pretended greatlie to sorrowe and repent their falt and pro-

tested to make amendes for the same, not onelie by reforming but also by spending their lyves as occasion shoulde be offred in yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> service. They gave some testimonie thereof in the late northern jorney. And as we heere do accordinglie frame them selfs now in their cuntrey, falling to lyke of the plough. And therefore considring what stirring fellows they are if anie occacon of sturr shoulde be offred, or that them selfs shoulde rayse anie, we are of opinion (under better reforma<sup>co</sup>n), that as things stand now, it were better to pardon them then either to pursue them, or (specially) anie lengre to protect them. And so, if they have but half the graves that they ought and seeme to have, be so thoroughlie devoted to yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> service and obedience as men that throughe yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> gracious clemencie have received a new lyef, and will accordinglie endeavor them selfs to deserve the same.

The Countesse of Desmonde lay at Clonmel, where she was allowed a diet of viii<sup>s</sup> per diem for her self, her daughters, and weemen. Wee thought it not meet to continue that chardge to yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup>, And therefore, both to cut it of, and to be the surer of her, we have cawsed her to be removed to this castle. We thincke her estate to be verie bare, and muche she lamenteth, and earnestlie desyreth to be sent over to yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup>. We have no warrant to proceede againste her by lawe, to send her over or releive her. We therefore humily beseche yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> to geve some direction concerning her.

By one article of yo<sup>r</sup> h. instructions to me yo<sup>r</sup> Deputie, yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> referred to us to consider what course were best to be taken w<sup>th</sup> the Erle of Clanricarde. Upon advised conference of all things depending upon that cawse, we thought it the best way and moast agreeing to yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> service to grant unto him yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> pardon. His dutiful dealings since hath given us cawse to pray yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> to think the same well bestowed upon him: he having yelded good testimonie, not onelie of a well reformed, but also of a well affected subject. For being of late called upon by yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> chief Commissioner of Conaght to serve against Orwirk, who in delivering in of his pledges as was ordered made some stay, he attended w<sup>th</sup> his forces readelie and served forwardlie, as the said chief Co<sup>m</sup>missioner hath advertized. And further upon the furst demaunde agreed to deliver in both his sonnes pledges. The younger he presentlie placed in Galloway at Schole. The eldre and his heir the Lo: of Dunkellen he hath sent hither to me yo<sup>r</sup> L: Deputie humily desyring me to send him over to yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> w<sup>ch</sup> I have presumed to do, and with him Orwirk's son (2 principal bands for Connaght,) not doubting but yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> will geeve ordre for their educac<sup>o</sup>n, that they may hereafter serve God and yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> as they ought to do.

We have thought good to make choise of this bearer S<sup>r</sup> Lucas Dillon, chief Baron of yo<sup>r</sup> Mat's Exchequer as the fittest man to carrie over this dispache, as well because he hath ben a doer in the iorneyes and services don, since I the Deputy received this chardge: and thereby can the more particlerlie declare all things w<sup>th</sup> their circumstances. As also for that he being learned in the lawes, and otherwise sufficientlie instructed is hable to confer w<sup>th</sup> suche as yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> shall appoynt for settling downe of those Statutes that we have sent over by him, or there shalbe thought

meete to be enacted, and for yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>tie</sup> to geeve yo<sup>r</sup> royal consent unto at the Parliament to be here shortlie holden. Humily beseeching yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>tie</sup> w<sup>t</sup> yo<sup>r</sup> accustomed favor in respect of his good deserts, to vouchesaf him yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> gracious speeche and presense, and to return him w<sup>t</sup> a gracious speedie dispatche. God long blesse and preserve yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup>. From yo<sup>r</sup> h: Castle of Dublin the xxiiii<sup>th</sup> of Octobre, 1584. Yo<sup>r</sup> Ma<sup>ty</sup> faythfull subiects and bounden servants,

J. PERROT.

Ad: Dublin Canc.

THOMAS MIDENSIS.

J. NORREYS.

ROBERT DILLON.

ED. WATERHOUS.

THO. LE STRANGE.

J. GARVEY.

GEFFRAY FENTON.

IRISH CORRESPONDENCE, STATE PAPER OFFICE.

No. 89. (*Indorsed*) *Archb. of Dublin*, 1585, *Julii* 18.—*Countes of Desmond*.—(*Directed*) *To the right honorable my singular good Lord, the L: Burghley L: high Treasurer of England.*

It may please yo<sup>r</sup> L. I am driven at this time to trouble your L. by the importunacie of the Countesse of Desmond, earnestly requestinge me to signifie to yo<sup>r</sup> L. hir bare and miserable state heare; we<sup>h</sup> chefely movid me. She hath receavid p<sup>don</sup> for hir lyfe, and have entrid into bonds of ten thousand pounds not to make clayme to any lands w<sup>h</sup> were assured to hir by hir husband as a zointtor. I assure your L. hir case (being chargid w<sup>th</sup> childrin) is so miserable that seldom the lyke hath bene sene in a woman of hir calling. All hir frends (I know not upon what consyderation,) have quite forsaken hir: so as if yo<sup>r</sup> L. w<sup>th</sup> the rest of that honorable boord, be not a mean to hir Ma<sup>ty</sup> to graunt unto hir some portion to releve hir and hir childrin, there is no doubt but very shortly they all will goo a beginge: and although hir offence hath deserved severitie, yet she emongest the rest hopethe to tast of hir Ma<sup>ty</sup>'s clemencie; so leving hir and hir misery to your L. goodly consideration I humbly comitt your L. to the blessings of the Almightye God. From Dublin this 18<sup>th</sup> of July, 1585.

Your L. most humbly at commandment.

Ad: Dublin, Canc.

IRISH CORRESPONDENCE, STATE PAPER OFFICE.

No. 90. (*Indorsed*) 1585, *Sept.* 4.—*The Countes of Desmond*.—(*Directed*) *To the Right Honorable my singler good Lord the Lo: Burghley, Lord high Treasurer of England.*

Right honnorable and singler good Lord, my humble duetie unto yo<sup>r</sup> honnor remembrid yt maye please the same Albiet her Ma<sup>ty</sup> of her



highnes bountie sent direction to the Lo: Deputy of this realm to passe unto me her Ma<sup>tie</sup> graciouse pardon, yett the same was staid from me untill the xxviii of Maye last, at w<sup>th</sup> tyme before I could receive my pardon, I was fayne to enter into recognizances of X<sup>m</sup> <sup>li</sup>, (£10,000) that neither my self nor eny other to my use shall make tytle, challenge, or entrie to eny dower jointo<sup>r</sup>, or thirds of eny parte of my late husbands lands. And also I was fayne to fynd suerties and enter in other bands, thatt neither myself nor eny of my five comfortles children, shall nott departe this realme, by meane of w<sup>th</sup> bands I can notte enjoy my thirds or jointo<sup>r</sup>, neither can I obtayne licens to go into England to be a petitioner to her Ma<sup>tie</sup> for the same. So, as I and my children have livid in suche calamitie thatt if my Lo: Deputie had nott taken pittie of me and them in relevinge us owtte of his Lops kitchin we might have starvid w<sup>th</sup> hunger: for in my necessitie all my kinsmen and frends here have utterly forsaken me. And sinc my Lo: Deputy w<sup>th</sup> drewe his liberalitie from me, I and my children have tasted of so moche myserie thatt I protest unto yo<sup>r</sup> honno<sup>r</sup> I knowe no waye howe to presarve me and them from perishing by famyne, except her Ma<sup>tie</sup> do nott relieve us. For my relief owtte of this pouertie I entred a supplicacon to my Lo: Deputie who inclosed the same w<sup>th</sup> in a lre of his Lordships directed to the most honorable lls of the Counsell referringe the same to be considered of by their honnors. Therefore I most humbly beseche yo<sup>r</sup> ho: Lo: (for God's cause,) to take compassion of my distressed case, and to be a meane, that like as it hath pleased her highness to spare my lief, so it may likewise please her excellency of her accustomed clemency to send direction to my Lo: Deputie to lett me to enjoye my thirds and jointo<sup>r</sup> the w<sup>th</sup> although at this present it be in wast and shall growe of long tyme butt to small comoditie, yett it may be a great releif unto me and my poore children, as know<sup>th</sup> God, whome I beseche longe to preserve yo<sup>r</sup> honno<sup>r</sup> in all felicitie. From Kylynely the iiiii<sup>th</sup> of Septembre, 1585.

Yo<sup>r</sup> ho: Lo: most humbly to comānd,

E. DESMOND.

IRISH CORRESPONDENCE, STATE PAPER OFFICE.

1587, Aug. 27, enclosed in

1587-8, Jan. 8.

(Indorsed) 27 Aug. 1587.—*The L. Deputie to the L. Roche, in answere to his desyre for leave to goe into England, as also to his advertisement that the Countess of Desmond ment to passe into England.—(Directed) To my verry good L. the Lo: Roch.*

After my verie hartie commendacons to yo<sup>r</sup> Lo: I have receyved your lres of the 21 of this instante, wherein you renewe your former suite touching your going over to hir Ma<sup>tie</sup>. A thing w<sup>th</sup> in respecte of the troublesomenesse of the time I may not yet graunt, but the beginninge of the next terme, I mean then, if you send to me to answere your

request. And for your titles I have sent the Queen's solicitor thither to consider thereof.

Touching the Countesse of Desmondes going into England y<sup>t</sup> is more then I knowe, neither can she goe w<sup>th</sup> out licence from me so to doe, w<sup>ch</sup> she is not like to have.

So fare your L. hartely well. From Dublin the 27 of August, 1587.

Yo<sup>r</sup> L. very loving frinde,

J. PERROT.

IRISH CORRESPONDENCE, STATE PAPER OFFICE.

No. 101. (*Indorsed*) *Irl.* 1587, *January* 8.

*The Lord Roche with twoe Lrēs from the L. Dep. to him.*

By which appeareth how earnestly he desyred leave of the L. Dep. to goe into England: as also that he foretoeld the L. Dep. of the Countesse of Desmonds purpose to pass over into England. Desyreth my favorable lrē to the L. Dep. that advantage of his bond of C<sup>i</sup> be not taken by the sayd Countesses comyng over.

(*Directed*) *To the right honno<sup>r</sup> and my assured frind S<sup>r</sup> Fraunces Walsingham Knight, of her highnes moste hono<sup>r</sup> privie Councell, theise be.*

Right honnor. my dutie remembred unto yo<sup>r</sup> honno<sup>r</sup> I doe send yo<sup>r</sup> honno<sup>r</sup> herinclosed the L. Deputie is lrēs (as I promysed to sende) concerning his deniall of geving my lycense to repair unto the Courte, whearby yo<sup>r</sup> honno<sup>r</sup> may judg wheather he hath sheowed my that favo<sup>r</sup> w<sup>ch</sup> may be easlie w<sup>th</sup> out any prejudice extended to any other, and I not any way culpable for my departure, considering howe hardlie this twelvmoneth and better he hath stayed my from that journey, and in the meane tyme hath lycensed dyuerse others of the nobilitie of the realme to passe thither, and of the inferior sorte a greate many, w<sup>ch</sup> hath occasioned my to adventure the daunger thereof (yf any their wer as there was none at all). I certified unto his lp of the privie departure (which I understand) of the Countes of Desmond for whome I was bound in 1<sup>e</sup> pounds Ster. w<sup>th</sup> others, that she should not depart w<sup>th</sup>out lycenc, whose answer thereuppon shall appere unto yo<sup>r</sup> honno<sup>r</sup> by the said lrēs. So praing yo<sup>r</sup> honno<sup>r</sup> to contynue yo<sup>r</sup> accustomed favo<sup>r</sup> and furtherance to wards me, I homblie tak my leave. Bristoll the viii<sup>th</sup> of January, 1587.

Yo<sup>r</sup> honno<sup>r</sup> most assured in what he may.

M. DE RUPE AND FERMOY.

I feare to be troubled for the departure of the said Countess of Desmond for the sum of 1<sup>e</sup> pounds aforesaid. I doe therefore beseech yo<sup>r</sup> honno<sup>r</sup> considering that by the said lrēs I certified thereof to the L. Deputie, yo<sup>r</sup> honno<sup>r</sup> would uppon some convenient tyme writ yo<sup>r</sup> favo<sup>r</sup> all lres to th<sup>e</sup>nd that I may be dischardged therin.

## IRISH CORRESPONDENCE, STATE PAPER OFFICE.

*No. 104. (Indorsed) The humble petición of the Countesse of Desmond to the Right honorable Mr. Secretary Walsingham.*

To the Right honorable Sr Fraunces Walsyngham Knyght, principall Secretary to the Queens Ma<sup>ty</sup> Right honorable, Whereas by your good meanes her Ma<sup>ty</sup> bestowed on me 1<sup>o</sup> marckes, who havinge nothinge elsse but the same to releve me, in hope I myght bee the better payde I lay in Dublin, w<sup>ch</sup> being not payde me accordinge her Ma<sup>tes</sup> direcçõn and your hono<sup>r</sup> expectacõn, I was enforcede to rounne in credit for w<sup>ch</sup> I owe duple for every thing I hadde. And nowe beinge these xii. monethes here in greate mysery, where I have lyved all the while on lyke credit, and havinge sent my Lo: Tresourers l<sup>res</sup> to Sr HyWolloppe in procuringe the payment of suche mony as was due to me, w<sup>ch</sup> my man colde in nowyse receyve, eyther to discharg part of my creditors in that country, or healpe my pore children, whose myserable estate beinge reddye to peryshe dothe dayly cry out for relefe, besydes the extreamty I endure here w<sup>th</sup> my poore famylly. In tender consyderaçõn wherof, I most humbly beseche your honnor, lyke as I acknowledge you have bene the only and furste procurer of my relefe sence my unfortunate fall: so nowe to my exceeding comforte vouchsafe the contynewaunce of your honno<sup>r</sup> able favoure, so as by your good meanes I may have the furste yeres pencion of my last graunt payd me nowe, to supply my present wantes: protesting to your hono<sup>r</sup> my credit is quyght spent. Besydes the mysery I knowe, and am credybylly enformed my children endure in Irland, wherin your hono<sup>r</sup> shall (as you have alwayes donn) bynd us to pray for your hono<sup>r</sup>, &c.

## IRISH CORRESPONDENCE, STATE PAPER OFFICE.

*No. 104. (Indorsed) M. to the Deputie of Ireland for the Countesss of Desmond, Sept. 1588.*

Right trustie and well beloved wee greete you well. Whereas y<sup>e</sup> Countesse of Desmond hath been an humble suter here unto us to relieve hir poore estate and miserie, whereunto she is brought by hir late husband's rebellion against us. Wee having compassion of hir unhappie and miserable estate, whereunto she is fallen, rather by hir said husband's disloyaltie, than by anie hir owne offence, are pleased for hir owne reliefe to bestowe on hir an yearely pencion of two hundreth pownds sterling, to be paid hir quarterly owt of o<sup>r</sup> Excheq<sup>r</sup> of that realme during hir . . . . . And therefore theise are to will and comaund you o<sup>r</sup> Deputie to cawse a patent to be made from us and passed under o<sup>r</sup> greate seale of y<sup>e</sup> realme, of the said annuitie of CC<sup>li</sup> by yeare, to be paid quarterly, as aforesaide, to the said Countesse by the hands of o<sup>r</sup> Thr<sup>r</sup>, at warres there for the time beeing, ether of such mony as cometh to his hands of o<sup>r</sup> revenewe there, or of such treasure as shalbe assigned from us here to him. And in so doing theise o<sup>r</sup> l<sup>res</sup> shalbe sufficient warrant and discharge, as well to you o<sup>r</sup> Deputie, and to o<sup>r</sup> chancellor,

and to our now Thrér, at warres of that realme, as to anie other o' Deputie, or chiefe Gov<sup>r</sup> nor, and to anie other o' Chancellor or keeper of o' greate seale of that realme, and anie other o' Thrér, at warres there, for the tyme being hereafter. Given, &c.

IRISH CORRESPONDENCE, STATE PAPER OFFICE.

No. 109. (*Indorsed*) *The humble petiçon of the Countesse of Desmond, to the Right honorable the Lls. of Her Ma<sup>tie</sup> most ho. privie Counsell.*

Having no meanes to live but upon her pencion, w<sup>ch</sup> she cannot gett paid in Irland, Desyreth the same may be paid out of the Exchequer here.

*To the Right honno<sup>r</sup>able the Lls. of her Ma<sup>tie</sup> most hono<sup>r</sup>able privie Counsell.*

Most humbly maketh petiçon to your most ho: good Llps yo<sup>r</sup> poore and daylie Oratrix Elleanor Countesse of Desmond. Whereas it hath pleased the Quenes most excellent Ma<sup>tie</sup> of her princely favo<sup>r</sup>, in Marche 1587, to bestowe upon you<sup>r</sup> poore supl. for her relief a yearly pencon of II<sup>li</sup> to be paid in Ireland. So it is most honorable that notwithstanding the same graunt yo<sup>r</sup> Oratrix doth live in most lamentable sort, by reason she is not duellie paid of her said pencon; having receevid sinc the graunt thereof but one hundreth pounds at X<sup>p</sup>as last, w<sup>ch</sup> she did owe for her diet long before that tyme. Sins w<sup>ch</sup> tyme she ranne in creditt untill Easter. Her creditors (being not paid of their former debt) would no further lett her have meate, drinke, nor eny other necessaries. So that hitherto yo<sup>r</sup> Oratrix (being in the meane tyme spent even to the uttermost) feeleth suche extreame penury, as she and her poore famylie are more like to perishe for want of food, than longer contynewe the misery thereof, if honorable compassion be not speedily extended therin. Yt maye therfore please yo<sup>r</sup> ho. Llps in relief of your poore supl. needy estate (considering she hath nothing wherewith to mayntayne or comfort her but her pencon, and that ther is no hoape for her to receive it in Ireland), to be meanes unto her Ma<sup>tie</sup> that the same pencon may be paid owtte of th' Exchequer in this realme, where she maye be paid so moche of her pencon as already is due, wherewith she maye paye her debts, and procure her further creditt. And she shall praye for yo<sup>r</sup> good Llps, &c.

IRISH CORRESPONDENCE, STATE PAPER OFFICE.

No. 109. (*Indorsed,*) *A Note of the clere remainn due to the Countesse of Desmond upon her pencon ending xxx Marcii 1589.*

Ther is due to Dame Ellenor Countess of Desmond for her pencon of c<sup>ii</sup> [cc<sup>ii</sup>] Ir. p. an<sup>m</sup> due for ii whole yeares and a quarter begenyng from X<sup>p</sup>as 1586 (at which tyme her La: was full paid,) and ending at the feast of th' annyciacion of o<sup>r</sup> Ladie 1589, the some of . cccxxv<sup>ii</sup> Ifi.

whereof

Ther hath bene imprested to her La: in A° 1587.  
 A° R. R<sup>mo</sup> Elliz xxix by severall bills  
 Reñ. . . . . xxxii<sup>n</sup>  
 And in A° xxx<sup>mo</sup> 1588, to her La: by the  
 hands of Moris Shighan her Agent as by his  
 bill Reñ aperith . . . xxxi<sup>n</sup> v<sup>s</sup> ii<sup>d</sup> ob. lxiii<sup>n</sup> v<sup>s</sup> ii<sup>d</sup> ob.  
 And so remayneth clere due uppon this recko-  
 nyng for her La: pençõn, ending at o<sup>r</sup> Ladie { clxi<sup>n</sup> xiiii<sup>s</sup> ix<sup>d</sup> ob Iri.  
 daie next 1589 the sum of . . . for ster. { cxxi<sup>n</sup> vi<sup>s</sup> i<sup>d</sup>

Whereof impressed to the said Moriss Shigham by Bill vi° Marcii  
 1588, vi<sup>n</sup> ster, so reñ cxv<sup>n</sup> vi<sup>s</sup> i<sup>d</sup> ster.

## STATE PAPER OFFICE.

1589–90, Feb. 9.—The following is an extract from a docquet of Irish  
 suits:—

*Countess of Desmond (90).*

That whereas her Ma<sup>tie</sup> hath graunted her a pençõn to be paid out of  
 the Exchequer here, Desireth their Ll to bee a meanes to her Ma<sup>tie</sup> to pay  
 . . . . . Warrant for the same, she lying here . . . want and at verie  
 great charges  
 Also her Sonne being diseased as Mr. Leutenant . . . . . craveth  
 their Ll carefull consideration of him . . . . . of his health.

BRITISH MUSEUM, LANSDOWNE MSS., No. 156, p. 114, extract:—

*Pentions and Annuities granted by her late Ma<sup>tie</sup> (Queen Elizabeth).*

By the yeare Countesse of Desmond . . cc<sup>n</sup>  
 2 Daughters of the said Countesse . . lxvi<sup>n</sup> xiiij<sup>s</sup> iiij<sup>d</sup>

## STATE PAPER OFFICE.

*Notes of Documents.*

1588–9, Jan. (21).—To enquire what has been answered to the E. of  
 Desmond, and others, on chargeable lands.

1589, Oct. 14.—Sir R. Greynville to Walsingham, “Concerning the  
 state of Munster, and the government of the Desmond, before the rebel-  
 lion, and the value of the lands.”

1589, Oct.—Commissioners in Munster to P. Council. The tenants  
 and pretended proprietors of the chargeable lands shew ancient charters  
 proving their title to the lands before Desmond or any Geraldine had  
 footing there.

Think they should pay *Shraughe* and *Marte*\* to H. M. as they did to Desmond.

1589, Dec. 15.—Petition of Morish Shigane to the Lord Treasurer to take order for the relief of the Countess of Desmond, before Mr. Secretary Fenton departs.†

1589 (*Circiter*) Cal. 195.—Names of the 8 persons excepted out of the Act of Attainder of the E. of Desmond.

*From Calendar Patent Roll, 1 James I., part 1, page 5.*

LVIII. 17.—King's letter for grants of pensions of 50<sup>l</sup> each to the Lady Jane Fitzgerald, and to Ellen, and Elizabeth, her sisters,‡ all sisters of the late Earl of Desmond. 4 Sept. 1st.

MONDAY, APRIL 22, 1861.

REV. CHARLES GRAVES, D. D., President, in the Chair.

THE REV. WM. REEVES, D. D., read a paper—

ON THE TOWNLAND DISTRIBUTION OF IRELAND.

THE civil distribution of Ireland, in the descending scale, is into Provinces, Counties, Baronies, Parishes, and Townlands; and under these successive grades of classification every acre of Ireland is accounted for in that noble compilation, the Census of 1851,—a work which, independently of its ostensible object, affords to the Irish topographer, next to the inestimable Ordnance Survey, the most valuable repertory of information in existence;§ and which would probably enjoy a higher literary character, had it been issued in a cover of any other colour than blue.

But this highly convenient distribution of the surface of Ireland is characterized neither by unity of design nor by chronological order in

---

\* Referring to the "Topographer," by J. G. Nichols, F. S. A., Part 14, p. 123:—"1587. Names of Rentes, in Money, Victuals, and customes, which were due to the Earl of Desmond:—

*Shraughe*, A yearlie rent in sterling money  
*Marte* A yearlie rent of beef."

† Morishe Sheghan (as he himself signs) was attorney for the Earl of Desmond in giving livery and seisin of the Earl's estates, under the feofment of 1574; and on the Countess Kathrin surrendering her castle of Inchiquin, 1575, to the Earl, the latter feofft it to Morishe Shegan in trust.

‡ Daughters of the rebel, Gerott, 16th Earl.

§ The census of 1841 descended no lower than the parochial division. There were, however, thirty-four fasciculi published in 1844, at one shilling each, in which the enumeration returns of *Houses* and *Persons* were given under the head of the several townlands. This was the first printed recital of all the townlands of Ireland. The census of 1851 adopted the same minute classification, and further added the acreable contents of every townland.